THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

o. 2 JUNE Vol. XLII

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Book for Bishops

'Hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches' was the text the last published sermon preached by Hastings Rashdall. In s sermon the Dean maintained that had Christian doctrine re-ained static and refused to adjust and develop itself in response the growing experience, understanding and needs of Christian ologetic and expansion, Christianity would have died out nturies ago.

This, broadly speaking, is the theme of Professor Basil illey's significant volume *Christianity Past and Present.** Dr. illey's initial statement that he was 'amazed' at being invited the Cambridge Faculty of Theology to deliver this course of ctures on the Christian Religion, might mislead readers into pposing that he is a mere amateur. On the contrary he pos-sses a profound knowledge of his theme and develops it in a any-sided and arresting manner. His method is to present the ccessive attempts of various notable Christians to rationalize e Christian Religion and the limitations and successes which tended their efforts.

Christianity Past and Present derives a significant interest om the personality and profession of its author. Dr. Willey, a yman, Professor of English Literature in the University of ambridge, writes not only as a Cambridge scholar but as a Chris-n prophet. He not only discerns the signs of the times, but res to declare his interpretation of them.

Amos, claiming neither to be a prophet nor a prophet's son

* *Christianity Past and Present* by Basil Willey, F.B.A. (C.U.P., 10/6, 52).

but a herdsman, 'a gatherer of Sycamore fruit' faced with the menace of his political and religious world heard the Lord say to him 'Go prophesy unto my people Israel,' and as a result was inspired to deliver a message which enabled him and those who accepted his message to develop their faith in God as the Divine Governor of the nations.

Although Prof. Willey

> 'finds a religious faith indispensable to the conduct and interpretation of life,'

yet hesitates to claim that he is either orthodox or even Christian. He recognizes however that many to-day share his outlook. His recognition of the existing religious confusions and contradictions in our English-speaking religious world leads him to ask a number of initial questions:

> What does it now mean, in these latter days, to be a Christian? Any attempt to answer this question will mean asking also: On what foundations is Christianity now supposed to rest? And this again leads back to the further enquiries: On what foundations has it been supposed to rest in former times? Have Christian apologetics changed significantly from age to age? Have any positions, formerly considered both vital and impregnable, been abandoned? And if so, is Christianity now merely clinging to a bridgehead against impossible odds, or has it found solid territory from which to mount an offensive against the principalities and powers? How far, and in what sense, is a Christian position tenable to-day? (p. 2).

What are the Christian Values To-Day?

Nearly a century ago when John Stuart Mill (who, by the way, was not regarded in church circles as a Christian) was asked: 'What is a Christian?' replied: 'So to live that Christ would approve our life.' On the other hand, Browning, regarded as a Christian by contemporary orthodoxy, when he wrote: 'How hard it is to be a Christian' demonstrated how much he had in common with Mill's definition.

But here's the rub. What Mill and Browning held in common is not regarded as an adequate definition of what constitutes a Christian by the leaders of our schismatic churches to-day—the greatest of which is the Church of Rome.

The situation to-day and it is no new one, is, as Mt. Arnold (a contemporary of Mill and Browning) observed:

> 'We cannot do without the Christian Religion and we cannot do with the Christian Religion as it is.'

It is to the practical solution of this problem that Prof. Willey makes his personal contribution. He asks:

> 'How is Christianity to be convincingly presented to the would-be or could-be believers and frontier-dwellers? (I am interested in that class of

persons, partly because I sometimes meet them, and partly because I sometimes seem to be one myself.) And, how is it to be presented to the enormously larger portion of mankind who have no religion at all?'

Prof. Willey is no pessimist and takes his stand on the reassuring basis:

'There is one point on which all who are not hostile to religion are now agreed: science and biblical criticism can now be seen to have rendered good service to religion by forcing it back upon positions which are invulnerable to both' (pp. 15-17).

The Modernist has been compelled to play a very difficult, and for reverent and loyal temperaments a very distasteful part in this warfare of reason *versus* religion. In some cases he was viewed as the feeble friend, in other cases as the secret enemy by both parties—in short, a humbug. Mansel, Bampton Lecturer and Dean of St. Paul's, F. D. Maurice's most formidable opponent, heralded in a satirical comedy the advent of the new liberalism in the following couplet:

'With a Bug, Bug, Bug, and a Hum, Hum, Hum,
Hither the New Theologians come.'

Neither the orthodox traditionalist nor the unflinching truth-seeker desired the allegiance of this newest species of Mr. Facing-both-ways. Dr. Willey writes of Leslie Stephen, who resigned his Orders and College Tutorship in response to the claims of conscience and received immortality by producing the *Dictionary of National Biography*:

'In Stephen's attitude to modernism we may perhaps see the irritation of one who has rejected Christianity at seeing others trying to preserve it by bringing it up to date. He wants Christianity to be what it always was, so that he can condemn it and justify his own abandonment of it. If Christianity really means what Farrar and Maurice make it out to be, why do they remain in the Church which has always taught something very different?

It is thus that modernism, whether in Stephen's time or in our own, falls between two fires: both from the orthodox and from the infidels the cry goes up, "Let them be as 'modern' as they like, but they must not call themselves Christians." To be a Christian, a modern thinker must in Stephen's view be either dull or dishonest; dull, if he accepts the whole traditional scheme, though in that case he will at least deserve respect; dishonest, if he tries to modernise it, in which case he deserves nothing but contempt' (p. 125).

'It may seem odd, perhaps, that this liberal-rationalist should dislike all attempts to liberalize and rationalize Christianity; but the fact is that he regarded liberalism and Christianity as opposites. Liberalism which does not lead to agnosticism is dishonest, and Christianity attempting to be liberal is humbug' (p. 126).

Another contribution Dr. Willey offers towards the solution of the contemporary Christian problem is that propounded by the

Cambridge Platonists, pre-eminently Whichcote, that the rationalization of the Christian Religion must not be achieved at the expense of its supreme spiritual quality.

> 'Sir, I oppose not rational and spiritual, for spiritual is most rational.'

On Whichcote's restriction Dr. Willey comments as follows:

> 'But this faculty can only work freely when it is unhampered by the mists of passion: thus, the improvement of the Reason can be effected, not by merely intellectual exercises, but by the disciplining of the will and the purification of the affections. It is to the pure in heart, not to the clever or the orthodox, that the sight of God is promised' (p. 89).

Recognition of the Church's Embarrassing Commitments

Milton derided 'the Right Divine of Kings to govern wrong.' The Christian Religion from the outset was convinced, and as a whole rightly convinced, that it possessed supreme authority, but as we study Christian History it is clear to us to-day that the Church misinterpreted the nature of that authority and on a number of occasions exercised it in the wrong way.

What has been wrong with the formulation of the Christian Religion by its exponents since Apostolic times has been its exercise of authority in spheres where it had no right to claim such authority. It is the advance of reason in the spheres of science, literary criticism, historical criticism and so on which have successfully and successively demonstrated that the Christian Religion has been an unjustified invader and that it had no religious right to much of the territory which it claimed to dominate. Hence the Christian Religion has for some centuries past been fighting a series of rearguard actions, followed by retreats which have discredited its authority and reputation. The most enlightened centres in the Christian Church to-day recognize the cause of this disastrous strategy and are resolutely abandoning it.

Dr. Willey reminds us of the very vulnerable character of Anglicanism in the days of the great agnostics (T. H. Huxley, etc.) compared with the existing situation in Anglicanism to-day. That situation justified attacks by agnostics which, thanks to the Liberal Modernists, are no longer justifiable to-day. Yet comments Dr. Willey:

> 'To us their criticisms may seem perverse or irrelevant, but I think it is still salutary to follow and try to understand them. It is salutary for at least two reasons: first, because it helps us to remember how very recently Christianity has been freed from these embarrassing commitments — indeed even now it has only been so liberated in the minds of a minority of Christians; and secondly, it leads us to ask the important

question, a question too often lightly assumed to be unnecessary — how securely has Christianity survived the ordeal?' (p. 111).

'Agnostics certainly stand to lose much; they lose the peace, the assurances and the consolations of belief. But if they lose the comforts, they also escape the discomforts of orthodoxy' (p. 116).

THE CRUCIAL QUESTION AND ITS ANSWER.

Is it possible to promote a practical Christian Modernism which can constantly and consistently do justice to the needs of reason acting religiously and to the needs of religion thinking rationally? There is much to support an affirmative answer. Dr. Villey writes:

'Many hard things are said nowadays about the liberalism and rationalism of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the fashionable apologists of to-day clearly feel that they have outgrown it, and seen through it. But let there be no mistake here; they have indeed seen through it, that is, it is 'through' it that they have seen the truth. There can be no question of a return to the pre-critical stage; biblical criticism has been, Darwin has been, and it is in the light of such things, not in spite of them, that Christianity has recovered firmness. Every age negates its predecessor, and in so doing often forgets that its own affirmations absorb or presuppose the denials of the other. So let us remember, when making apologetic capital out of the bankruptcy of liberal-rationalism, that we are not to proceed as if it had never existed; we are to combine its insights with those of earlier days to produce, we hope, an insight deeper than that of either age' (p. 131).

No one has expressed more forcibly the spirit which must inspire this undertaking than S. T. Coleridge:

'He who begins by loving Christianity better than Truth, will proceed by loving his own Sect or Church better than Christianity, and end in loving himself better than all . . . to cleanse the heart is also to clear the head' (p. 132).

'Coleridge's characteristic approach can be well seen in his treatment of the first article of faith, the belief in God. It is a treatment which adumbrates the great modern change in the technique of apologetics — the change which has come about since the times when the existence of God was supposed to be self-evident, rationally demonstrable, ontologically certain, or proved by the evidences of Nature and revelation. For Coleridge the essential mark of this belief is precisely that it is not intellectually demonstrable, but morally necessary. "The law of conscience peremptorily commands it." Like the belief in free will it is one of the necessary postulates of the good life' (p. 136).

'Too soon,' as Coleridge affirmed, 'did the Doctors of the Church forget that the *heart*, the *moral* nature, was the beginning and the end; and that truth, knowledge, and insight were comprehended in its expansion. This was the true and first apostasy — when in council and synod the Divine Humanities of the Gospel gave way to speculative Systems, and Religion became a Science of Shadows under the name of Theology, or at best a bare Skeleton of Truth, without life or interest, alike inaccessible and unintelligible to the majority of Christians.'

In comparing Kierkegaard with Coleridge we are glad to note that Prof. Willey writes:

> 'For my own part I prefer the more moderate position of Coleridge, who dwelt not upon the "absurdity" of faith, but upon its necessary connexion with our moral and spiritual experience, and its immunity from the attacks of the unenlivened reflective faculty. To say that there are spiritual truths spiritually discerned, which are both unattainable by the fleshly understanding and invulnerable to its onslaughts . . . is one thing. To say, believe because it is impossible, hope because there is no ground for hope, is quite another. To the many despairers of modern times Kierkegaard's challenge may have brought the only possible invigoration, but I distrust an apologetic which derives its force from the existence of inward or outward agony' (p. 140).
>
> 'How far and in what sense is a Christian position tenable to-day? I hope, indeed, that I have already indicated or implied the sort of answer I should myself give to that question. It cannot be briefly answered, and I am not sure that it can be answered at all, if asked in that form. The phrase "Christian position" implies a system of doctrines, and we seem to have discerned that Christianity is nothing of the kind. We have seen what Christianity is not, what nobody need now suppose it to be. It is not bound up with pre-scientific theories of the world or of history, nor with misinterpreted prophecy, nor with biblical fundamentalism, nor with any form of reaction or obscurantism' (p. 142).

Therefore for Dr. Willey the vital question is not

> 'What must I believe to be a Christian?' but 'How can I become one?' . . . that Christianity can again, as at the beginning, be seen to begin in repentance and rebirth rather than in assent to doctrines and propositions' . . .
>
> 'All I can do is to state, with the utmost humility, how these things strike the sort of layman I happen to be' (p. 143).

Dealing with the Resurrection of Jesus Christ he writes:

> 'Yet, try as I may, I cannot bring myself to feel that my religion ought to stand or fall by the historical accuracy of such a story as this. I hope I have said enough to indicate that I realize the limitations of liberal-rationalism, and that I acknowledge the reality of that which transcends science and common sense and prosaic understanding. But, as I also said, I believe that although reason must be transcended in religion, and must yield to faith, it must yet be followed as far as it will take us. And to me it appears far more likely that this story is a vivid expression, in the imagery of those days, of a conviction that death could not be the end of what Christ had been — more likely to be this, than to be a factual account of what happened' . . .
>
> 'but as long as the Church means something quite different, I have to keep my mouth shut during the recital of the creeds' . . . (p. 148 f.).

The Bishops' Task in this Tension

In this state of dogmatic tension what is the task of our bishops, who are the guardians of orthodoxy? Some will say, 'Their strength is to sit still and remain silent.' That is not enough. 'To

o nothing,' said Bishop Francis Paget, 'when we ought to be oing something is the height of rashness.'

Dr. Willey demonstrates that in Church History there have een a succession of orthodoxies and that

> 'Ever since the beginning [vital Christianity] has been able to develop, and enrich its insight from other sources; and just as the Christianity of Aquinas differed from that of the apostles, so that of to-day may differ without loss of continuity. It is because I am convinced that in its real function Christianity has a greater part to play to-day than ever before, that I am so anxious to base its claims only on what I believe to be unshakable foundations' (p. 150).
>
> 'I remain scandalized myself by the central Christian miracles. By the miracles perhaps, but not by the mysteries' (p. 149).

It is perfectly obvious that if those are to be won to the hristian Religion and membership in the Christian Church, whom e may assume the bishops as well as Dr. Willey desire to include, iat dogmatic reformulation must be faced and achieved.

But it may be objected: 'Why should the English bishops ndertake it? The answer is because of the unique position of the hurch of England in Christendom. That is a fact generally cognized, at least by our bishops. But why should the *bishops* the Church do this?

The great dogmatic reformers in Church history have not been ishops. The author of the Fourth Gospel was not a bishop, as ar as we know. Neither was Athanasius when he won the Council f Nicea to accept the *homoousion*; nor Clement of Alexandria; or Tertullian; nor St. Thomas Aquinas; nor John Wcyliffe, rasmus, Martin Luther, Melanchton, Hooker, John Calvin, John olet, John Knox, John Wesley, and many more without whose ourageous doctrinal advances there would have been doctrinal agnation.

It is the business of the bishops to adopt and advance dog-atic reform. Without this action by the bishops we cannot secure ogmatic reform in the Church without schism.

Yet there is a worse alternative than schism. Kirsop Lake aintained many years ago: what the Church of England has to ar is not violent opposition within its ranks but silent desertion by ie vast majority of the laity. That is the situation which has be-allen us to-day, and only our bishops by united leadership can verse the defeat. Methods of dogmatic reform have for years een advocated by Modernists and we need not restate them ere: some of these reforms have been secured mainly to the relief f the clerical conscience, but these achievements hardly touch ie dogmatic problem to-day as it affects the laity, educated and neducated, who have ceased to attend our church services. The

situation in which those behind cry 'Forward' and those in front cry 'Back' is demoralizing and disastrous.

Will not the English bishops, as a body, face the dogmatic issue and publicly pronounce their policy?

The Primate's Pessimism and Dr. Micklem's Plea

The Primate in a sermon in Canterbury Cathedral on April 13, dealing with 'our unhappy divisions,' political, economic and ecclesiastical, attributed them mainly to the world's lack of a sense of proportion.

> 'It could not distinguish what was vital and primary, what was secondary and unessential for the lives of many, and what was debasing and devitalising. It could not deny itself anything. It wanted everything, and wanted it at once and by any means, and what it wanted it thought it had a right to without regard to other rights or to the wrongs thereby created.
>
> 'The Church is terribly handicapped in its witness by its own disproportions and divisions,' Dr. Fisher said. 'We dare not be anything but dismayed by the divisions within the ranks of Christ's people.
>
> 'We cannot yet be one for we are not fit for it. If the Church tomorrow became an organic unity the one certain thing is that it would betray yet more disastrously by its unity some truth of Christ and his gospel which by our divisions is allowed to survive and bear fruit.
>
> 'The Church is in the same danger as the world's politicians of being so jealous of their rights and so insistent upon them, so convinced of their own self-sufficiencies, so suspicious of the other side, so practised in saying no, so inhibited from saying yes, that the proportions are lost and the peace of God in his Church is as frustrated as the peace of God in the world.'

We are in entire agreement with the Primate's point of view in his estimate of the causes and controversies which beset the achievement of 'organic unity' by the Church of Christ. But surely this is not the issue at the present time for the Church of England. That issue is not 'organic unity' to be achieved by all the Churches of Christendom, but intercommunion between separated Christians in this country.

The first practical step towards their becoming one is that the Primate, with the support of the majority of the bishops in the Church Assembly, should declare that communicants of all Christian denominations are welcome to receive Holy Communion at the altars of the National Church. Of course, this first step would be strongly opposed by the *Church Times* and Anglo-Catholics of that type, but it would receive the whole-hearted support of the vast majority of the English laity and not a few — indeed, we believe a majority — of the English clergy.

Dr. Micklem, Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, in a ery able paper published in the *British Weekly* of March 13 (just month before Dr. Fisher's sermon) takes very much the same ew as does the Primate of the dangers and difficulties which set 'organic unity' as a Church policy, but he strongly favours hristian intercommunion. He concludes his paper as follows:

> 'But I would greatly wish that the Free Churches would declare themselves to be one church, the United Free Church of England, and would feel themselves to be one people even while there remain many differences of organization and habit and ethos amongst them, and I could wish that on great occasions such as Easter and Pentecost we might all meet together as one people and worship together, not because it is nice to be neighbourly but because we know ourselves to be one people. I of course would far rather we all joined with the Church of England and became the United Church of England, even while many organizational and temperamental and even theological differences remain, but that is impossible without intercommunion which the Anglican church refuses still. But then, as I said at the beginning, I am terribly impatient of differences.'

ow is it possible for the Primate to continue to ignore such a ea?

EHIND THE SCENES—'CROCKFORD'S CLERICAL DIRECTORY'*

In these difficult times for publishers and printers we owe rticular gratitude to the Oxford University Press for the vent of *Crockford's Clerical Directory*, 1951-1952, and in this rticular issue we are not a little indebted to its Preface. Crockrd's Preface always attracts attention as the most concise, comtent and critical Annual Register of the doings and mis-doings the English Church at home and beyond the seas. The fact at the Preface is anonymous adds to its interest.

The latest Preface, both in its vivacity and variety, surpasses en the best of its predecessors in recent years and we are sure at everyone fortunate enough to have access to this monumental rk will both read and digest the 'hard sayings' of its Preface ere it exposes the foibles, fallacies, futilities and failures of a erical policy which is striving in a multitude of ways to imitate apalism but dares not submit to the discipline of the Papacy.

Dealing with the failure of reunion negotiations initiated by e Primate's Cambridge sermon of 1946, the author of the Pre- ce writes:

> 'It is for the Church to decide whether or not in its corporate action the conclusions of those who hold the rigid doctrine of episcopacy shall control policy. On the question we express no opinion. We state the

* *Crockford's Clerical Directory*. (O.U.P., 1952. £5 5s. od.)

indisputable facts: (1) that the rigorist view finds no faintest echo of agreement in any Free Church; (2) that no imaginable formula, possessing but one meaning, can achieve theological unity between the rigid doctrine and the older practice and present state of belief in the Church of England; and therefore (3) that the Church must decide whether or not it will allow an intransigent minority to exercise a veto, more certain and as effective as that of Russia in the Security Council, upon all corporate action with which that minority does not agree' (p. xiv).

The Preface's comment on the latest exploits of the Mothers' Union is equally to the point:

'The Mothers' Union has broken formal connexion with South India, where work among women is of more vital importance than at home. One reason given by the President for this step is that it is not known if the South Indian Church accepts absolutely the view of the Church of England on the marriage of divorced persons. This is a characteristic example of what a nowadays unusually outspoken Bishop describes as "the modern fashion of attempting to stampede the Church into a break with its own traditions"; and here again there is inconsistency, for what the President says is not known about South India is certainly known about the Church of Scotland and the Eastern Church, neither of which shares the President's views on this matter, and with both of which the Church of England desires and has sought intercommunion.'

After criticizing the weaknesses which appear to have accompanied the multiplication of our Episcopate, including the absence of sound learning and convincing apologetic, the Preface proceeds as follows:

'There is one respect in which none could suggest that bishops nowadays do not adorn their office. We refer to robes and external decorations, high matters in which we have no expert knowledge. Our information is that long traditional practice and restraint have been largely displaced by sartorial idiosyncracy . . . We suggest that the new draft canons xvii and lxxxii should receive additional sections dealing respectively with the vesture and dress of bishops.

But we mildly protest against the increasing use of the most sacred symbol of Christian faith as a decorative preface to Anglican episcopal signatures, another imitation of Rome. When added by hand it generally takes the form of a plus sign. Formerly such recognizable signatures as F. Cantuar, and G. F. Bristol sufficed; it is now common to hear bishops referred to in the style of "Plus Aubrey" or "Plus Brian," which invites the comment that in many cases "Minus" would be more appropriate' (p. xix f.).

Turning from Papalism within the English Church to Papalism outside it, the Preface proceeds:

'In 1950 the Pope, with what must surely be classed as an exercise of the infallibility claimed for him, proclaimed the Bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary into heaven as a *de fide* dogma of that Church. The one point on which the rest of Christendom, and indeed of mankind, can agree is that, in its commonly shortened title, no dogma has been or is likely to be more aptly named' (p. xx).

There is one emphatic statement in this authoritative Preface which we dissent:

> 'No understanding of the Church of England can be other than false which does not recognize that as from the first, she represents a compromise' (p. xiii).

Inadvertently this assertion plays the ball into the hands of Church's detractors, whether Papalist or Protestant, who resent the Elizabethan compromise as sheer opportunism. The icy of the Reformed Church of England was based, not on mpromise but on *Comprehension* — 'the greatest good of the atest number.' An example of this is seen in the administra- n of the elements prescribed in Queen Elizabeth's Prayer Book). 1559) in which the two earlier *formulae* of Administration combined.

THE RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN JEWRY

By James Parkes, M.A., D.Phil., Author of *The Jewish Problem in the Modern World,* etc., etc.

EWISH history has reached a climax. It is neither the first, nor will it be the last, climax in the long story of the Jewish ple. But no other word is adequate to express the situation in ch the Jews find themselves to-day. The establishment of el marks a climax in Jewish experience, both communal and gious; the massacre of six million Jews by Hitler represents evil climax of modern antisemitism. Wherever we turn in con- plating the Jewish scene there is the same sense of a long cess having reached a culmination; and there is bewilderment uncertainty about the implications and consequences of this mination. New steps have to be taken to meet a new situation, they are inevitably hesitant and subject to controversy.

This is as true in the religious as it is in the political field; , in addition, in the religious field Jewry shares the experi- es through which Christendom has also passed. In each an ient and conservative religion has encountered all the problems ur modern world, and is still suffering from the shock. But in case of Judaism this common situation has been accentuated two features peculiar to Jewry. Simultaneously the main rce of the orthodox tradition has been wiped out in the destruc- by Hitler of ninety per cent. of Eastern European Jewry; in Israel one of the remnants of that orthodoxy has come to

dispose of a political power which has been absent in Jewish experience since the destruction of the Palestinian patriarchate by Theodosius II in A.D. 435.

In studying the religious scene as it affects Jews, we have, then, to take into account not merely the reactions — creative or otherwise — of Jewish theism to the modern world, but also the relations of religion to the state in a peculiarly intense form (for only a small minority in Israel are themselves orthodox in their daily practice). And both these questions affect not only the Jews of Israel, but the Jews of the *diaspora* also, in that no question affecting Jews to-day can ignore the question of Israel, whether its establishment is approved or condemned, whether it be claimed that the Jews are a people or a religious sect.

In relation to the modern world Judaism falls into three main headings: traditional, conservative, and progressive — very like Christianity. All these movements take their origin in the immense change wrought in Jewish life by emancipation, a movement which had its origins in the American and French revolutions, and spread slowly through Europe in the nineteenth century. Eastern Europe it never reached — except on paper. Up to emancipation, orthodoxy, whether Sephardic (Spanish) or Ashkenazic (German-Polish), was the only possible form of Judaism. Religion and nationality were identified within the ghettoes of Christendom or Islam, and one Jewish community could not easily have rival synagogal bodies. Once Jews became emancipated, they were not only brought into contact with the main stream of nineteenth-century criticism, scepticism, reformism, or rationalism, but they were also free individually to make their own religious pattern and to adhere to their orthodox synagogue, to found a new synagogue for themselves, or to abandon Jewish belief entirely. A progressive movement began in Germany in the first half of the century. It spread to England and America, and became extremely powerful in the latter country. Towards the end of the century a still more radical element split off from the reformers and, at the same time, a movement of modernization took place within the ranks of orthodoxy, creating a 'conservative' synagogue. The relations between these different religious streams are very similar to that within the Church of England, where Modernist, Anglo-Catholic and Evangelical are apt to look at each other with a certain amount of suspicion, and even alarm. But in the case of the Jews the situation is complicated by the fact that everywhere, even though sometimes to a minimal extent, Jews are a people, whereas Anglicans are not.

This is shown in England, for example, by the fact that the wish community is established by Act of Parliament, and by t of Parliament it possesses certain rights. It licenses Jewish nisters of religion to perform marriages. As with the Free urches, the right is not automatic. Somebody has to decide in h case. Now the Act allows the Jewish community to license bis to perform marriages 'according to Jewish law.' Some of traditional customs of Jewish marriages are no longer observed the progressive Jewish synagogues. According to the orthodox ir marriages are, therefore, not 'according to Jewish law.' Quite ently the reform synagogues in London have been unable to form marriage ceremonies, and the actual binding marriage had to be performed before a registrar, in spite of the fact that ording to progressive custom the marriage is totally 'Jewish.'

In Israel the problem is presented with an acuteness which kes the attempt of some Anglican authorities to rewrite and orce canon law seem a mild benevolence. The orthodox there resent but a small minority of the population; but they are anized as a political party and have, so far, succeeded in being ential members of the coalition governments of the country. nce they have a political power out of all proportion to their nbers. Ever since the creation of the State they have used power to embody in the laws of the State regulations which e previously voluntarily observed only by a minority. The te has been compelled not to import any meat which is not *sher*, in spite of the facts that it is very expensive, that Israel is riously short of foreign currency, and that most of those who eat it do not want *kosher* meat. Some orthodox even obliged State to import food for their consumption in order that they ht observe the Mosaic law that fields should be left totally ow every seventh year. They allow only orthodox procedure Jewish marriages, again in spite of the fact that most of the tracting parties do not adhere to orthodox practice. They will allow any public transport to run on the Sabbath. And so on. en thwarted, they can always produce a first class political is by depriving the government of its majority.

Nor is this all. The extreme wing of the orthodox entirely dis-rove of the existence of the State at all. They consider that el should live 'in exile' (*i.e.* under a non-Jewish government) n in the Holy Land, until the supernatural coming of the ssiah. During the siege of Jerusalem in 1948, some tried to vent the Jewish defence of the city on the Sabbath. Others t so far as to seek to transfer their residence to Transjordan.

To-day they make themselves conspicuous by violent assaults on 'Sabbath breakers,' burning cars, stoning 'desecrators' of the Sabbath and similar actions.

In America the considerable power of Jewry as a 'pressure group' has led to a violent schism between the pro-Zionist majority and a small but significant minority who see the bonds within Jewry as wholly religious, and denounce Zionist activities not only as a perversion of the Jewish tradition, but as a dangerous invitation to Jews to create for themselves a dual loyalty. For them citizenship is wholly American: their personal religion is Judaism.

This introduction of what to the non-Jew would be visibly civil or political issues into the religious field had invariably lent bitterness to religious differences; but, on the whole, they are secondary to the religious crisis itself. The varieties of religious expression brought into being by emancipation were naturally developments arising from the common root of historic Judaism. And the nature of historic Judaism imparted certain strengths and weaknesses to nineteenth and twentieth century developments.

Judaism was much less shaken than Christianity by the whole scientific world of ideas associated with theories of evolution. There was no doctrine of the Fall and the complete sinfulness of man comparable to that in Christian theology, and the first chapter of *Genesis* could be interpreted as the description of an evolutionary creative process. The doctrine of interpretation was so deeply embodied in the orthodox tradition, and the responsibility of the human intellect was so fully recognized, that the intellectual ferment of the nineteenth century proved immensely stimulating, but less destructive than might have been expected. It was the philosophic and metaphysical crisis of the twentieth century which found the weak points in the Jewish armour.

The absence of a systematic metaphysic or theology in Judaism had, indeed, been a help in the nineteenth century. In the twentieth it found the Jews defenceless against a variety of forms of atheism. The Churches rallied against this attack more successfully; they were at home in the field of theology and metaphysics, and were able to develop a whole range of modern theological movements, whether in Roman Catholic, in Anglican or in continental Protestant forms which could give as good as they received in the encounter of ideas. Jews had no comparable armoury. They had never developed a theology of their own, but had always accepted the monotheistic environment provided by Christendom or Islam. They accepted without question the existence of God,

d discussed only His activities. When it was God Himself ose existence was challenged, they did not know what to reply, d this was as true of the orthodox as it was of the progressives.

One has only to look at the curriculum of a Jewish theological lege, or at any rate a list of Jewish religious publications, to how small a part is played in Jewish thought by purely theo- ical studies. It is not merely that there is no speculative or ologetic literature demonstrating the existence of God, but re is almost no literature designed to illuminate His nature or s attributes. The whole attention of Judaism is concentrated on s activities, whether in Torah or Talmud, or in more general ms of justice, mercy and righteousness. His existence is umed to be beyond argument. This might appear a strength, d so indeed it was through long centuries of persecution; but it came a serious weakness as soon as Jews found themselves in environment where it was taken for granted that either there s no God or that His existence was a matter of no consequence men. Indifferentism was as difficult to meet for the Jewish igious leader as rank atheism. And, indeed, there are to be nd rabbis in America who regard the conception of a deity as human origin, but socially of sufficient value to be maintained the basis for teaching right living.

Recently there has been a reaction; and there is the beginning both a conservative and a progressive Jewish theology in erica. Here in England the problem has been less evident; if the orthodox are still satisfied with their emphasis on the ivities of God, the work of two remarkable leaders of the pro- ssive movement, Claude Montefiore and Israel Mattuck, has ated a progressive movement firmly rooted in acceptance of a d who is both personal and active.

It is, however, as true of Jewry as of Christendom that it is a nority only which concerns itself with religion or with synagogue endance. The synagogue has inevitably lost its place as the ial centre of the community; talmudic discussion occupies the ure hours of a rapidly dwindling minority. It is to some extent epetition of the decline from the medieval status of the parish rches, once used for many purposes other than formal worship. -day synagogues are often locked except when a service is ually taking place. This decline in interest in the synagogue among many Jews, an expression of lack of interest in the ole gamut of cultural or intellectual life. In others it is replaced Zionism, by Jewish social and communal activities; in yet ers by active participation in the communal life of the area in

which they live. But a large number of such Jews still maintain their one annual visit to the synagogue on the Day of Atonement.

There is nothing equivalent to the Day of Atonement in the Christian Year. It obviously ought to be comparable with Good Friday; but no one could maintain that, in Protestant countries at least, Good Friday is widely, not to say universally, observed. In fact many regular churchgoers do not observe it at all; and it certainly does not draw to the churches those who attend on no other occasion. Christmas is universally observed; but only among a minority as a really religious festival, whereas the Day of Atonement has no significance whatever other than religion. It might be said to be the most striking of the paradoxes in the relations between the two religions that the Day has such an importance in Judaism. For it is Christianity which places a much higher emphasis on man's sinfulness and need of repentance, and one might have expected the consecration of a whole day to fasting and repentance to be a Christian observance. I think the explanation lies in the profound Jewish recognition of man's responsibility for his actions. He is not protected from responsibility by any doctrine of the Fall, of his inherent sinfulness or of a vicarious atonement on his behalf. It is therefore natural, even for a Jew otherwise indifferent to religion, to accept this annual reminder of his responsibility and of his need for amendment.

One final subject which any treatment of the religious situation in Jewry must include is the Jewish attitude to Christianity. There also one can speak of a climax. The traditional attitude to the figure of Jesus of Nazareth has been radically transformed in the last century. There has been a similar change in the estimate of the religious destiny of the non-Jew (the *Goy*), and in consequence there has been a fresh assessment of the position of Judaism as the religion of Jews *vis à vis* Christianity as a religion of the non-Jews. In these two latter matters the roots of the present general attitude go deep into the past of Talmudic and rabbinic exegesis. They are modern only in the sense that they have been chosen out of a variety of attitudes as the one most satisfactorily covering the situation.

Traditionally the attitude to Jesus of Nazareth is represented by a scurrilous lampoon entitled '*Sepher Toldoth Jeshu.*' Having its origin (possibly) in the lost Gospel of the Hebrew Christian Church, it took the main line of the Gospel narrative and gave to each incident a twist which became more unpleasant in successive editions as Christian persecution increased the feeling of bitterness in the ghetto. Jesus was 'the deceiver of Israel' who was

ntly executed for his witchcraft and blasphemies. It was the inning of familiarity with higher criticism among the emanci- ed Jews of France and Germany in the middle of the nine- hth century which made possible a re-estimate of the figure the prophet of Nazareth. By treating the Gospel narratives in itical manner (the criticism was sometimes a little naïve) a new ture was evolved of a reasonable Jewish rabbi, feeling a special sion to the 'outcasts of Israel,' who was erroneously deified his later Gentile worshippers. Along this line the colours of picture have been steadily heightened, and respect for Jesus Nazareth steadily increased until such pictures are produced as t of Sholem Asch in *The Nazarene*, where the Jewish author s not conceal his admiration for a figure he regards as of que significance in Jewish history. In this whole development onsibility for the Christology of the Church was naturally own largely on Paul. To-day there is an interesting develop- nt on the treatment of Paul also, but that is beyond my scope e.

The contemporary attitude to the religion of the non-Jew goes k to a famous Talmudical saying that 'the righteous of all ions shall inherit the world to come.' The bitter remarks about *Goyim*, which are beloved of a certain type of New Testament olar and of more vulgar antisemites, nearly all deal with a anism which was not only socially and sexually degenerate, also an immediate and real menace to Jewish life. There has er been the same condemnation of theistic religions, even when monotheism thereof has been thought to be shaky (as with the istian doctrine of the Trinity). The othodoxy of the ghetto of Eastern European Jewry up to its massacre by Hitler recog- ed the religion of the *goyim* as being their proper religion, and aving its place in the overall divine process in history.

On this basis it has been possible to develop a doctrine of the e of Judaism in the general scheme which satisfies the modern gious Jew. Its roots can be traced as far back as Maimonides or her, and, in brief, its thesis is that God devised Christianity n its greater emotional appeal (centreing in personal devotion Jesus and the conception of personal salvation through His rious sacrifice), and its less strict monotheism for the Gentile d. For the Gentile mind was too unformed to accept the much ner theological and personal discipline of Judaism, with its k insistence on the responsibility of man and the ultimate ossibility of defining the attributes of God. In this way istianity was the divinely ordained preliminary to the ultimate

revelation; and in the meantime there were no universal obligations incumbent on Jewry. Their whole duty lay in their fulfilling themselves the obligations laid upon them by God.

That there has been in recent decades a comparable change on the Christian side is well known. It is no longer possible for a Christian who has any respect for the facts to dismiss post-biblical Judaism as a dead, legalistic burden which only conversion to Christianity could remove. Men like Travers Herford and George Foote Moore have made this impossible. But while in one sense one can speak of the two religions having reached the climax of a long process of development (for Moore and Herford have predecessors in the seventeenth century in men like Selden and Surenhuis) in their attitude to each other, I suspect that this climax in *attitude* is but a prelude to a new chapter in *relationships*. In every field *relationships* will, I hope, be the keynote of the new period into which Jewish history is entering. For it is a new experience for the Jewish people to be treated as equals by non-Jews. To-day, wherever one looks at the Jewish scene, Jews are escaping from the position of inferiority to which they had been condemned, by both Christianity and Islam, through the long centuries of the ghetto. Whether in religion or in politics, they have established their separate existence, not as a fossilized survival, but as a living people with a living religion, and a living destiny. The new paths to be trodden will not be easy. But they can be immensely fruitful, not only for the Jews themselves, but for those non-Jews also who accept them as equal partners in the adventure of humanity.

JOHN TODD

1886—1952

THE Modern Churchman's Union comprises in its ranks a number of antiquarians, and it has recently lost a well-known ember of this class by the death of John Todd, Rector of aterstock and Vicar of Waterperry, who passed away on the h of May.

A son of Northumbria, he became an exhibitioner of Hatfield llege and Hebrew scholar of Durham University. After aduating in 1910 he was ordained, and having spent several ars in parochial work became T.C.F. in the First World War. e was stationed at Salonika, later in Northern Italy after poretto and finally on the Western front. Here, from the ram-rts of Ypres he witnessed the Kaiser's midnight assault on that rtress. After the Armistice he migrated to Hertford College, xford, where he graduated in the Honours School of Theology. nence he went as lecturer in Divinity to Trinity College, ronto, but returned to England in 1923 to become Rector of aterstock and Vicar of Waterperry.

His war experience had roused in Todd an interest in the ntiquities of the Mediterranean lands. This was greatly veloped when Sir Henry Lunn appointed him Lecturer and uide in connection with his Hellenic Tours. Todd's enthusiasm, ited to his firm conviction in the absolute necessity of scientific search, thus secured a unique opportunity for its exercise. He me to know, as a result of personal inspection, every archaeo-gical site worth visiting, ranging from Tadmore in the Syrian sert to Timgad in French North Africa.

> 'He is the best cosmopolite
> Who loves his native land the best'

d it is by his archaeological researches in England, particularly the vicinity of the Roman Wall, Hartlepool, his native city, his le Oxford parishes of Waterperry and Waterstock, and not st in the City of Oxford itself, that he is best known as an iquarian.

In 1944 Todd was deservedly elected a Fellow of the Society Antiquaries. The British Museum employed him to give lec-es on the *Codex Sinaiticus* to the crowds who came to see it er it had been acquired from the Bolshevic authorities of Lenin-d for £100,000. In Hartlepool he made some remarkable dis-veries which, although they discredited various venerable local

traditions (especially those dealing with the Scottish hero, Robert Bruce), added not a little to the reputation of the discoverer.

Whilst abounding with antiquarian knowledge and the zeal to impart it, both in lectures and conversation, it was only with the very greatest difficulty that he could be induced to write anything for publication. We are grateful, however, for nine articles from his pen published in the *Modern Churchman*. One of these, in view of the approaching coronation, entitled 'Is our King a layman?' (Vol. XXXIII, 1944, pp. 324-332), possesses a particular interest at the present time as the Salic Law does not prevail in Great Britain. Before his death Todd had completed, in conjunction with Professor Gask of London, an essay on the origin of hospitals to be included in a collection of essays, *Science, Medicine and History*, in honour of Professor Charles Singer, to be published shortly by the Oxford University Press. He had also in hand at the time of his death an article on the Cult of Æsculapius destined for the *Modern Churchman*.

Todd was essentially an educationalist who delighted to dispel 'vulgar errors.' An amusing example of this were his 'Talks to American soldiers' on British freedom, intended to demonstrate that Great Britain had a much better right to be regarded as a 'free country' than has U.S.A. Although his lectures were intensely popular in their mode of delivery, yet they contained matter both of interest and value to the specialist. Accurate teaching demanded sound methods of research, and Todd counted no pains too great to secure the solution of an archaeological problem however minute. Perhaps none valued his exposition of his methods more than the teachers of those subjects with which he dealt. A testimony dealing with the effectiveness of Todd's work as a popular educationist, contributed by one of H.M. Inspectors, reflects the enthusiasm of his auditors — a great multitude:

> 'The students have, I know, by their manner and in their own words expressed in full measure to you the best thanks that any teacher can receive. I feel sure that what you have done will be spread by your pupils among a large number of young people. You are "the father of us all. I hope that you will be proud of your family".'

Oxford University appointed him to give lectures on the antiquities of Oxford to conferences of visiting teachers. A favourite theme of his was 'History through the Parish Church,' and anyone who was fortunate enough to have him as their guide in 'going round' his Parish Church at Waterperry treasured a memorable experience. The account of the antiquities of that ancient little church, and Todd's own adventures in discovery and

ıe unravelling of its archaeological problems was something never) be forgotten — what was forgotten was the passage of time.) ven schoolboys missed their tea time without being conscious of ıe fact.

Dr. Hassall, the Keeper of Western MSS. in the Bodleian ibrary, in a personal letter which must be cited in full, thus :cords Todd's contribution to archaeology in Oxfordshire :

> 'He was a zealous student of local history, a member of the Oxfordshire Record Society who did much to make known to his less learned neighbours those facts about the past of South Oxfordshire which he discovered. He was a regular attendant at the meetings of the working committee of the Oxfordshire Victoria County History and had started to write histories of his own parishes and other places nearby. His consciousness of ill-health forced him to abandon the hope of finishing these histories, but in handing over his collections to younger hands he generously promised to give all help in his power to his successors. Only those who have a personal knowledge of his scholarly conscience and generosity in putting his time and skill at the disposal of others can have any conception of the loss which his death must mean to those who enjoyed his help.'

So far we have stressed the contribution made to local archae- :ogy and its educational value by this 'country parson.' Country arsons are often tempted to complain of the uninteresting charac- ır of their environment and the little they can do educationally r their uneducated parishioners. John Todd's life was an ample of a rural clergyman who thought and acted otherwise. nere are not a few rural clergymen who, with advantage to emselves, to their parishioners and to the advance of antiquarian nowledge in this country, might well follow his example.

But, it may be asked : Where did Todd's service to the cause Modern Churchmanship come in? He did his best to give odern practical teaching to his tiny congregations, but he also ove to modernize the Occasional Offices in our Prayer Book. He ceived his reward for his modernized service of Infant Baptism nen a good mother after its use said to him : 'I have had five ne but this is the first time I ever knew what they was doing.'

In Ripon Hall, Todd lectured on church antiquities, and tored in Hebrew those students who dared to venture into the rld of Semitic philology. At clerical meetings his zeal for truth spired him to frank and fearless condemnation of fanatical perstition and tyrannical obscurantism. Doubtless there were casions when he would have done well to have given heed to alleyrand's advice : '*Surtout, point de zèle*' — but the *façon de rler* of the Quai d'Orsay is not that of Northumbria.

H.D.A.M.

'A TIME FOR GREATNESS'

By the Rt. Hon. Sir Stafford Cripps

We republish as our most appropriate and grateful tribute to the memory of Sir Stafford Cripps the following address, *A Time for Greatness,* which we were privileged to publish in the *Modern Churchman* of March, 1945, when its author was President of the Board of Trade. The address emphasizes what the *Times* obituary notice (April 22nd, 1952) reiterates, that 'with all his insistence on controls, no man was more clearly convinced of the limitations of legislative action and no man more deeply aware that only a process of fundamental moral regeneration would avert calamity.'

THE difficulties and perplexities of the times ahead of us are so immense that no one can doubt the need for 'greatness' in the handling of them. But we may ask ourselves what sort of greatness is required, and how are we to secure that necessary greatness in the world? What sort of situations shall we have to meet and what policies will be necessary for those who have to deal with them?

Perhaps the first matter to remind ourselves of in this relation is the actual manner of dealing with international relationships in our practical everyday life. First, of course, comes the fact that decisions can only be arrived at by agreement between a number of different countries, and that however admirable our desires and hopes may be they are useless and of no account unless we can influence the actions of others or achieve an agreement with them upon practical courses of action. A small amount of positive action in the right direction resulting from international agreement is worth more than any amount of sentimental hope which results in nothing at all. It is certainly not a case of all or none. In international affairs it is a matter of getting as great a measure of agreement as possible and of making advances, however small, provided they are in the right direction.

Indeed there may be a positive danger that those with progressive and international views may try to force the pace in such a way as to stimulate strong nationalist reactions either in their own or in some other country, with the result that the outcome in terms of action is definitely unfavourable to the peoples as a whole. Secondly, let us remember that the actual international arrangements and policies are arrived at by individuals meeting and discussing just as we are meeting and discussing here, but with this difference, that each one of them is constrained by the directions, advice, inhibitions and so forth of the Government he represents. That Government in its turn is affected and guided by what it

lieves to suit the people of the country, or to be in accordance th their wishes.

There is thus an indirect chain between the peoples' thoughts d the formation of policies and political action internationally. nrough this chain must come the pull of all the many diverse tional public opinions. But over and above these different and fering pulls of opinion, there is an influence of world public inion upon any world conference. It may not be very strong or cisive, but it is nevertheless felt quite distinctly by those taking rt and it can and does influence their decisions to some degree least. It is certainly a factor in the situation to be counted.

Whenever there is an international meeting to discuss and cide policies there will be represented Governments of all sorts d kinds. Some more democratic, some less, some with barely the nblance of democracy. In many cases, therefore, the opinions pressed will be those of an individual or a small group or class nationals. In every case it will be a matter of ordinary indi-duals — not super-men, though perhaps more experienced and re intelligent than the average, but nevertheless essentially dinary human beings with human emotions — who will be meet-g together and deciding these great issues.

But we must further remember that even the best forms of mocratic machinery easily become misrepresentative. It would a bold person who would say that to-day our Parliament repre-nts the views of the people on any particular issue or that our overnment always represents the views of Parliament, or that r representatives at international conferences or international nversations always represent the views of the Government. At y one of these three stages there may be a conscious or uncon-ous misrepresentation. But then who can say what is the view the people on a complex international issue? Very often it will merely emotional, without reasoning or understanding; indeed e knowledge which alone can form a basis for understanding is en wholly and always partially missing.

A time for greatness — whose greatness? Where and how is e influence of that greatness to be brought to bear? Clearly we nt it as wide as possible, that influence of greatness, amongst classes, peoples and religions, if we are to mobilize a public inion that can influence the action of those who will be respons-e for formulating the policies of the post-war world.

The first foundation, indeed the only true foundation, for eatness is the moral and religious faiths of the people. Mere pediency or the rival internal interests of different individuals, sses and nations can never form the basis for *great* actions, in

the sense in which we are using the word. At the same time we must not disregard those human desires, ambitions and fears which are bound to play a large part in the actual determination of our future. We shall not come to wiser decisions if we neglect these very material considerations and overlook their influence and power. A realistic appreciation of their tremendous potency may enable us to fight the better against them; at least it will make it possible to estimate their strength and to judge how best we can overcome them.

The time for greatness does not mean the time for great thoughts and high ideals only; it means much more than that—the time for self-sacrificing acts, for bold policies fearlessly carried through, for taking chances against apparently heavy odds. But such action can only come from inspired individuals or groups; it cannot come from the apathetic, careless and ignorant. There must exist some power beyond ourselves which can lead us, despite our own selfish wishes and fears, to take action for the salvation of humanity.

Just as in the war we are taken out of ourselves, and are cleansed of our selfish desires and enjoyments, by the higher call of our community to sacrifice our personal interests in the blood and sweat and tears to which we are summoned, so in the years that lie ahead, when it is possible for us to influence the world towards a new state of peace and happiness, we must be prepared to follow the call of Christ at least as faithfully and with as great a measure of sacrifice as we have followed our human leaders in the time of war. We are called by Christ to help in building His Kingdom here on earth. We must, then, spread the Gospel of His inspiration if we are to make any headway against the difficulties that lie before us. We have the promise of His help if we ourselves will try. We know the prize of happiness and peace that can be won for the world; and we know, too, or we should know, the dangers, the reverses, the tragedy and the suffering that lie in the path of our attempt.

How then should we act, as Christians hoping to inspire the peoples of the world to new hopes, in this time of great ideals and great actions? One thing I beg of you : do not allow yourselves to be carried away by your own utopianism. It is so much easier to build wonderful castles in the air than it is to think out and place the hard and much more humdrum buildings of actual international relations. If only our wishes could come true to-morrow, we should find no difficulty in wishing for the perfection of friendship, equality, justice and peace in the world by the miraculous transformation of human nature. But we know that that cannot be.

hat the people of the world have so ruthlessly destroyed they ust build up again slowly and with suffering. Not only has there en a vast material destruction throughout the world, but there s been an equally and even more devastating moral destruc-n.

Practically the whole peoples of the world have thrown themlves into methods of mutual destruction which have, most turally, led to a deterioration of that slowly forming and sometnes superficial desire for brotherhood and friendship which we w before the war. In great parts of the world bestialities and ominations have been practised which have not only brutalized ose responsible for them but also those to whom they have been ne, while the constant spectacle of these foul deeds has made of us less sensitive and more oblivious to their practice. Where one time we should have raised our voices loud in clamour ainst the torture or death of one innocent victim, now we hardly tice the destruction of hundreds and thousands.

It is in a world still torn by the fears, the sorrow, the pain, the ony of the history of the last five years that we have to start on the process—the slow and gradual process—of building the ew Jerusalem. There is no short cut to Utopia in such an enronment. We shall find a new generation grown up that has ver known what we would regard as normal times in the world, nes when we had hopes that compacts and treaties would be noured, when neighbour nations could trust one another for a ne at least, and where some kind of rules of decency were obrved in international dealings, even in war itself. That new neration knows only the rule of violence, of starvation and tred, of slavery and murder, and we must remember this very tent and discouraging fact when we come to plan our new licies.

Further than that, a new range of fears has been created in the rld. The fear of the new weapons, each more ghastly and dible than the last, each carrying its destruction further and ther into the territories of other nations. No one knows — or er can — the climax of the terrors of this unending exhibition of man ingenuity or how frightful will be the weapon of another r if it should come. You may think that that is in itself an argunt for safety. So it may be when once the neighbouring nations ve been persuaded to some way of destroying or vastly diminishthe danger of future wars. Till then, the greater the terror more violent will be the fear complexes within which we must tle our new international policies, and the more difficult will it to get agreement upon such matters as disarmament or any

concerted international action for diminishing the risk of war. If the terror is so great, then every country will at least want to re-insure itself by its own armed might until the strength of a peace-keeping international organization has been amply proved in action.

How tense and unsettled the whole world has become as a result of the strains and stresses of war has been shown in a small way by events in the once-occupied countries now freed from the Nazis, such as Greece and Belgium. Add to all this the physical destruction with its sequel of lack of food, clothing and housing, and above all of mass unemployment, and you will get some sort of picture of the world in which we must exercise our greatness. I emphasize these points not to depress or to discourage you, but that you may not have any false picture of what it is we have got to do, if we are to succeed.

There is at least one factor on the other side, or a factor which might be made effective on the other side. The peoples of the world are vastly weary of war and slaughter and want only to be left alone to follow out their own vocations in peace. This may mean one of two things: either a violent and helpful reaction against war and all that has been responsible for war, or a dull and leaden apathy once the war is over, the apathy that leads to disillusionment and frustration in the long run.

These difficulties that exist, once they are known and realized, should in themselves create a challenging determination in men and women of goodwill to work together that they may overcome all obstacles to their faith. The greater the hazards and the tougher the obstacles, the more determined must be our effort. That is all to the good; there is no doubt that we in our generation have been given a chance of service to Christ as has been given to no other generation before us in the world. It is indeed a time for greatness. There is another lesson that we must learn from the discouraging facts that I have mentioned.

We have to persuade others to act; we cannot ourselves in this room, nor can we in our churches, lay down the policies which will rule the post-war world. That is for others; we can only act as part of the machinery of persuasion. We shall certainly fail in that persuasion unless we are as realistic in our outlook as those we try to persuade.

Though Christians have rightly shown themselves as idealists, it is an unfortunate fact — and this again we must face fearlessly and in all humility — that their idealism has not been a practical idealism as it might have been. As Christians we have thus earned a reputation for 'pie in the sky by-and-bye' rather than for practi-

measures to produce the best we can here and now. We are so often with the arguments 'That's all very well, but . . . ,' 'Yes, but it's no good thinking in terms which assume that all are Christians or perfect.' We must adapt our thinking to the s of the situation and we must not allow ourselves to be carried y by our own emotional hopes.

How then are we to bring the greatness of our Christian faith teaching into the hard practical realities of the international ation, some of which I have tried to point out already? Per- s the best way to examine the problem is to take the most cult of all the questions that will arise after the war and see we can get our idealism into a practical answer, Let us take problem of the treatment of Germany and the Germans after war.

The first problem is to make up our minds as to whether we entitled to judge of the merits of the situation as between many and the United Nations. 'Judge not that ye be not ged' is a sound Christian principle, but it does not mean that re not to form any opinion as to right or wrong. What it does n, I think, is that it is not for us to condemn others because an certainly never be free from guilt ourselves. 'Let him who ithout guilt cast the first stone.' We are entitled and indeed nd to say that we believe the aggressive brutality of Germany rong and that her neighbours have suffered innocently.

Having arrived at that decision, we must beware of exercising Christianity in one direction only, and that towards the evil- . There is always a liability for Christians to force themselves xercise restraint and even friendship towards a wrong-doer e perhaps overlooking the plight of the victim. While we pay regard to the brotherhood between the Germans and ourselves. ot let us forget that there is equally a brotherhood between the ssians, Danes, Norwegians, Dutch, Belgians, French, Czecho- akians, Poles, Greeks, Yugoslavs and ourselves. These nged peoples are as much or more entitled to our friend- , sympathy and support in the future as are our defeated nies.

Then, too, we must take into account the state of mind of these rent peoples as it will emerge at the end of the war. It was truly said by a very eminent British Judge that the state of a 's mind is as much a matter of fact as the state of his stomach. is is true, and one of the most material facts in the post-war ition will be the national states of mind that will exist in ope. Certainly they will be antagonistic, bitter, revengeful full of fear and hatred. It will be of no avail for us to say

that these attitudes are un-Christian; they will be facts with which we shall have to deal.

It is certainly not for us to be revengeful in our action. 'Revenge is mine,' saith the Lord, 'I will repay.' But we must as practical Christians take into account the fact that the spirit of revenge will be latent throughout Europe, and perhaps in our own country too, though that has not been overrun by the enemy. As Christians we must try to assuage those feelings of fear and hatred so as to create an environment in which they will gradually and by stages disappear altogether. It would be quite idle to proceed upon the basis that by some miracle of conversion we could wipe them all out in a day.

We must also be quite realistic as to the situation that is likely to exist in Germany iself. The whole of the younger generation that survives, and many of the older ones too, will have been imbued with a fanatical materialistic nationalism that is very strong and deep-seated. The end of the war will not destroy that spirit in the Nazis. They will continue working, as their predecessors did after the last war, to revenge their defeat. That too is an undoubted fact that we must take into account. We must, therefore, while doing our utmost to persuade them to a more Christian outlook, also devise methods by which we can offer protection to their innocent neighbours against a recurrence of their experiences during this century which, although we are not yet half way through it, has already brought two world wars in Europe.

Now none of these considerations need affect our ultimate objectives of a peaceful structure for international society, but what they must determine is the steps which we shall try to take immediately after the war by which to arrive at our ultimate objective. If we try to advance too rapidly we shall miss our goal entirely, because the existing fears and hatreds will destroy blindly any peaceful international structure before it has the time to become consolidated. We must found our permanent building upon the true Christian principles of equality, justice and brotherhood, but we must in the initial stages shore up those foundations with buttresses against the immediate impact of those widespread feelings of revenge and fear that will pervade Europe. We shall not succeed if we try to build a flimsy, showy and elaborate structure with all the speed we can, but rather by a slow and patient construction which will be able to stand against all the evil storms that are sure to beset it from the very beginning.

By trying to make our idealism fit the practical circumstances in which we shall have to work we arrive, then, at some such plan as the following. No revenge against the people of Germany but

tection for their frightened neighbours. The Germans are to regarded as human beings like ourselves, equally brothers in human family and sharing the fatherhood of God.

But in the light of past experiences, if we are to have any hope assuaging the passions of hatred and revenge in Europe, we st make certain decisions as to the future of Germany which remove or diminish the understandable fears of a recurrence what has already happened twice in this century. We must, efore, demonstrably put it outside the limits of likelihood that Germans, whatever their leadership, shall again engulf Europe the world in war. To do this they must be disarmed effectively prevented from re-arming, especially in the air. The exact sures that are necessary to accomplish this must of course be certed amongst the United Nations. We must, too, try and st the boundaries of Europe on a safer pattern — one more ly to bring peace and happiness to the people.

We must attempt to wean the Germans from Nazi leadership ideals, though we can do little in this direction from outside ept perhaps by our example. We must by dignified and just hods bring the worst wrong-doers to account, not because they ght against us, but because of the inhuman cruelties they have ecessarily committed in the course of the war. We must vindi- the decencies of human relations both to destroy the desire indiscriminate revenge and to establish standards of inter- onal behaviour.

To the German people we, as Christians, would say: 'We re to treat you as brothers and with friendship, but we must st upon taking measures to protect and comfort our other opean brothers upon whom you and your leaders have inflicted untold suffering. Our desire to help you and to bring you k into the comity of nations cannot override our duty to pro- for the future those others who have suffered so much in the . We are not your judges — God alone can judge of human ons and motives — but we shall take what practical steps we to provide for a safe period of absence of war, during which an start to build the more permanent structure of human peace.

Such steps will inevitably affect you and your country be- se we must secure your neighbours against the fears they feel egards a recurrence of aggressions from your territory. When time comes that the passions generated by the war have died n, and you have been able to convince your neighbours of true desire for friendly and peaceful co-operation, you will ble to join with all the other nations in the elaboration of such nternational order as will obviate the danger of future wars.'

That seems to me to be the very difficult and painful path of practical idealism so far as Germany is concerned. Above all we must not act in a spirit of revenge or so as to advantage ourselves at the cost of others.

There is one more word I would like to add. Our Christian faith must be implicit in our whole lives and in all our relationships if we are to succeed in the task of greatness. We cannot be Christians in international politics unless we are also Christians in our more intimate and personal relationships, and above all in our relationship to God. Do not let us lecture others on how they should behave, because none of us have yet learnt to be wholly Christian ourselves. Christianity not only means love, but humility too.

If we are to give an example, if we are to preach the Gospel of Peace, then we must live Christianity as individuals. In our personal life, in our family life, with our friends and fellow-countrymen we must show the truth of our faith. If we do that, then we can, I believe, accomplish something real in the sphere of international politics. We, as humble Christians, can show the world the greatness which our times demand.

A STRIDULOUS GRASSHOPPER

By D. L. Scott, Rector of Creeton, Lincs.

THE *Ingoldsby Legends* are familiar to us all, but what are the *Ingoldsby Letters*? There is no link between the two except the satiric touches which the Letters have in common with the more celebrated Legends. They are not the work of the Rev. Richard Barham, *alias* Thomas Ingoldsby, Esquire, but of the Rev. James Hildyard, for some forty years Rector of the Lincolnshire village of Ingoldsby, near Grantham. Born in the stress of the Napoleonic Wars, a time which, it has been noted, was particularly fruitful in the distinguished men it produced, Hildyard was a scholar of some repute. He was a Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, and on the death of Arnold in 1842 was an unsuccessful candidate for the Headmastership of Rugby. He might eventually have reached the episcopal bench if he could have curbed his pungent wit and tamed his independent spirit. But choosing to do neither of these things, he accepted, in 1846, the college living of Ingoldsby, where the rest of his life was spent.

His *Letters* appeared in various journals, above the signature goldsby,' mostly from 1858 to 1862, when they were first published in collected form.[1] Though light in style their purpose was gether serious — the revision of the Book of Common Prayer. fact, they are a most significant contribution to the subject of yer Book reform, besides the many interesting sidelights which y throw on other aspects of the history of the Church of England at that time.

It has been said of the year 1848 that it was the turning point which Europe failed to turn. It might similarly be said with h that the year 1860 was the turning point at which the Church England failed to turn. It was the year immediately following publication of Darwin's *The Origin of Species*; it was the r of *Essays and Reviews*; it was also the year which saw the nand for a shortened and simplified Liturgy appreciably gather ngth. In short, it was a year of challenge, a time when the rch had to commit itself either to renaissance or to reaction. hose, beyond question, the latter alternative. Samuel Wilberce in his grotesque debate with T. H. Huxley fixed the attitude e adopted by 'good churchmen' towards Evolution, thereby ging the conflict between religion and science to a head. *ays and Reviews*, at first ignored, soon became the subject of eral condemnation when that same worthy prelate discerned e lurid glare of Anti-christ' arising from its pages. This meant, ng other things, that war had been declared between orthoy and biblical criticism. At the same time the movement for yer Book revision was met by a petition against it signed by ly ten thousand of the clergy. The list was headed by the e of R. C. Trench, then Dean of Westminster and, significly, examining chaplain to Samuel Oxon. For on this subject, the Oracle had spoken and declared that the Prayer Book ld not be touched in his day.

More even than *Essays and Reviews*, or the debates on Evolu, the movement for Prayer Book reform in which the Rector ngoldsby played a leading part is now a forgotten episode. ay be said to have begun in 1857, when a petition drawn up Hildyard and containing some three hundred hastily collected atures was presented to the House of Commons on July 28 by d Robert Grosvenor. Its object was to show:

> 'That your petitioners are of opinion that the Book of Common Prayer . . . is capable of such modification in its arrangement and

[1] Fourth Edition, 2 vols.; London, 1879.

> Services as to render it far more profitable than it now is for the religious instruction and edification of the people;
>
> 'That your petitioners believe that a Royal Commission is the safest and least objectionable mode of dealing with the consideration of that book with a view to its revision. . . .'

The Indian Mutiny, then beginning, led to the Petition being set aside, but it was the signal for the campaign both for and against liturgical reform to commence. The extent to which revision was desired was in fact modest enough. Hildyard's primary concern was no more than the sanctioning of a shortened form of morning service. This at the time consisted of Morning Prayer as far as the Third Collect, followed by the Litany, which in turn was followed by the ante-Communion, and sermon preceded by the Bidding Prayer. If the Communion itself were administered, the words of administration were to be said in full to each communicant however numerous these might be. It is not surprising to learn that the service could last from two to three hours.

But even this sensible request that the service might be shortened by due authority met only with a steady refusal. When Convocation met in 1858, the Bishop of Lincoln (Jackson) declared:

> 'He was quite sure that there was no sympathy on the part of the great body of the clergy and laity of the Church of England with those crude attempts to shorten her services which had been witnessed of late by entire omissions, and by bringing together different parts of different services, in total forgetfulness of the true and deep meaning which ran through each service. . . . The main reason why the services appeared long, unhappily, to large numbers of their congregations was that they had not formed habits of devotion' (*Ingoldsby Letters*, I, p. 11).

In reply Hildyard asks:

> 'How many of the millions who *ought* to attend the public worship of God in the church are capable of . . . entering fully into this "deep and hidden meaning"? Is the preacher to be continually dwelling upon the hidden mystery of the various parts of our Liturgy, in order that his hearers may be alive to its esoteric beauties and excellencies, and duly appreciate them as they severally arise? I apprehend this is hardly fulfilling our Saviour's precept, "The poor have the *Gospel* preached to them"' (I, p. 33).

It was, however, easy enough for the bishops to take up so complacent an attitude. The churches were reasonably well filled with long-suffering congregations, even though the service might last from eleven o'clock until half-past one. Why then trouble about shortening it and thus spoil its hidden meaning? Who could then foresee that the day might come when the country parson would find his morning congregation reduced to single figures, or

chance find no congregation at all? Besides, the bishops were stly getting on in years and questions like the revision of the yer Book could be so distressing. They did not really want to unreasonable. It was generally understood that Archbishop nner was privately sympathetic towards liturgical reform, and Bishop of St. Asaph (Vowler Short) had actually written a k supporting it in his youth. But with their more energetic eagues opposed to it, it was better to let the Hildyards storm out than face the tempestuous hysteria of Wilberforce within r own conclave. No wonder if they were terrified by the effect he said revision might have upon the poor and the unedud. 'It would,' he told them, 'shock their simple feelings of otion and do a mischief the exent of which no man can cone' (I, p. 94). The Bishop of Salisbury (Hamilton) was also wn to be opposed to revision, though he was not present on occasion. He had recently told his clergy that the blood of Apostles was in his veins and that he had been ennobled by it. fear not to say,' he declared, 'that I have received, by the ing on of apostolic hands, the spirit of power, and of love, and a sound mind.' What wonder then if the majority of his hren, not being blest with so deep an assurance, nor with the phetic insight of a Wilberforce, felt it safer to defer to those had? Accordingly they expressed themselves as opposed nimously[2] to any revision of the Prayer Book at the present time.

'What a pity,' Hildyard observes, 'that their Lordships cannot inspire the inferior clergy with this delightful attribute, so peculiar to themselves, of dwelling together in unity. There is something marvellously cohesive in the texture of the episcopal toga. . . . However opposite their sentiments have been before donning the magic lawn, the right reverend conclave becomes thenceforth . . . all of one mind, one colour, one purpose, one creed; and woe betide the hapless individual who ventures to interpose his opinions between the wind and their unanimity' (pp. 206-7).

Even Tait and Thirlwall, the two really outstanding bishops ne day, have to be included in this unanimity. Both of them e against revision, though Thirlwall had advocated it in a nt Charge and Tait was presently to change his mind. Certi y it could not be said of *them* that they stood in fear of the op of Oxford. That Thirlwall, at once the most learned and liberal prelate of his time, should in this case have proved

[2] They did, however, recommend that the Lord's Prayer might be omitted the sermon, even at the risk, so they said, 'of being supposed to have jection to the Lord's Prayer altogether.' 'A novel and curious illustraof the *Mons Parturiens*,' is Hildyard's comment.

reactionary brought down upon him the scathing criticism of Ingoldsby:

> 'Each party will for the moment think to claim the right reverend prelate as his own, and will prepare to rejoice and make merry accordingly. When, hey presto! the bird is flown; the aqueous god has dissolved into his native element; he has vanished into thin air. . . . The animal has quietly slid away while the council of cooks are in warm debate as to whether they shall serve him up fried or stewed' (I, p. 103).

As the refusal of the bishops to support or sanction any form of Prayer Book revision became clear, the reforming movement gathered strength by the joining together of several groups of revisionists. Though Hildyard himself desired no radical change, there were others who sought drastic alteration, for whom the acceptance of the Prayer Book wholly unrevised was a severe strain. The Clerical Subscription Act of 1865 came as a partial relief to some; but for others it came too late. They had already laid their ministry aside from sheer despair at the solidity of reaction all around them.

We are so used nowadays to hearing from all quarters of the abundant blessings which the Oxford Movement has bestowed upon us that even to question them is regarded as a sign of eccentricity. Nevertheless, the situation of the Church of England following 1860 was to a large extent, directly and indirectly, the result of the Tractarian Movement during the previous quarter of a century. Amongst the consequences of the Movement must therefore be reckoned the consequences that have followed from that situation. That theological liberalism did suffer severely as a result of Tractarianism — whether for good or ill — can hardly be disputed. Had it not been for the judgment of the Privy Council in the case of *Essays and Reviews*, it would have suffered much more severely. The Gorham Judgment in 1850 had saved the Evangelicals from being thrown into the arms of Dissent, and an even worse disaster might have befallen if the accused Essayists, partially convicted by the Court of Arches, had been allowed no further appeal to the Sovereign in Council. But even as it was some secessions from the Church of England did take place. It is probably not generally realized that about this time a small but not altogether inconsiderable body of clergymen, though entirely loyal to their Church in spirit, felt obliged to withdraw from their ministry because they felt acutely that the letter of the Prayer Book was being imposed upon them too straitly, imposed in a manner that had not been known to them at the time when they had taken Orders. Hildyard, in the course of his letters, gives several examples of these, and it is instructive to learn from one

them (he resigned his office before the judgment of the Privy Council in the case of *Essays and Reviews*) how he attributes his action to the change which had come about through 'the revival of Church principles'[3]:

'The confused and contradictory mass of theology,' he says, 'contained in our Book of Common Prayer has been permitted to supersede the Word of God in our National Church, and it becomes the duty of every man to consider whether or not he is justified in remaining in it. For my own part I have no choice. I have contracted two obligations which after more than twenty years' consideration, I find it impossible to reconcile. I pledged myself "to be diligent in the reading of Holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same, and out of the same Scriptures to instruct the people committed to my charge." . . . In doing this I have published opinions in direct opposition to some parts of the Prayer Book. No relief can be obtained from the Legislature, and I abandon my position as utterly untenable. . . . If I maintain that the Ordination Service, the form of Visitation of the Sick, and the Baptismal Services are in the most essential points opposed alike to Scripture and to reason, and are so considered by a very large majority of the people of this country, it is a poor answer to tell me that I am a traitor for reviling doctrines which I have sworn to defend. But am I a traitor? I gave my assent to the present Prayer Book on the faith of explanations to be found in the works of Paley, Wheatley, and Tomline, which were put into my hands by the Church herself. I signed my contract on the express understanding that actual consent to the Thirty-nine Articles was never expected of me . . . that the Athanasian Creed was altogether a forgery, the damnatory clauses much to be lamented; and that there was no difference whatever in the condition of baptized and unbaptized infants who die in infancy. The "revival of Church principles" has set aside these Latitudinarian explanations, my contract has been fatally changed' (*Ingoldsby Letters*, II, pp. 249-50).

Hildyard himself strongly repudiated the suggestion that a clergyman may not honourably criticize the Prayer Book which he has promised to uphold:

'[The clergy] have *not* pledged themselves,' he declared, 'to "love its faults." They have nowhere and never said that they considered it perfect and incapable of improvement. They have *not* bound themselves . . . to resist all attempts to adapt [the Prayer Book] to the advanced intelligence of the people; any more than a judge or magistrate, who is sworn to administer the laws, is thereby pledged to resist all amendment or repeal of the same' (I, pp. 80-1).

Meanwhile the controversy over ritualism was raging in a most unseemly manner. On one occasion, Hildyard informs us, as

[3] The Rev. Christopher Nevile, Vicar of Thorney Abbey, near Peterborough. Hildyard admits that some of his theories are 'rather wild.' But the significance lies not in these but in the contrast he alleges between the liberalism of the Church at that time—1861—and the latitude of a generation later.

many as four hundred police were required to keep the peace during public worship at St. George's in the East.[4] It is all very well for us to smile at the recollection of scenes such as this — whether in pity for the ignorance of the Protestant mob or in admiration of the Catholic innovators. But, as the *Letters* very clearly show, the spectacle of these riots, of the Prayer Book used or misused in so strange a fashion, its rubrics interpreted in unheard of ways—all this made a deep and harmful impression upon a people of whom the majority were still more than formally attached to their National Church. It alienated their sympathy to a far larger extent than it is now fashionable to believe. The Bishop of Carlisle (Villiers)[5] — the one prelate who raised his voice in concert with Hildyard — spoke with far truer insight than his brother of Oxford ever possessed when in 1860 he said :

> 'In dealing with the Revision of the Liturgy, we must look to the state of the National Church at large. What are we compelled to witness? Not the calm and simple method of carrying on Divine Worship in the Sanctuary which characterised our Church service in the days of our youth . . . but we find in these days a parish church the scene of uproar disgraceful to us as Churchmen — nay, more, as Englishmen. . . . I find a people irritated by the introduction of customs which, if legal, had at any rate become obsolete. I find the bishop of the diocese unable to control the use or abuse of forms and ceremonies; and I am persuaded that such scenes within the sacred buildings, such weakness on the parts of the Heads of the Church (the law at present giving them no power to interfere), and such bitterness of language used on all sides, are altogether undermining the affections of the laity towards the Church. I fear the result must be serious and lasting injury to the cause, not of the Church of England only, but of the great Head of the Church, even our Lord Jesus Christ himself' (*Ingoldsby Letters*, II, pp. 37-8).

But there seemed to be few who shared his fears. The Church of England, as Tait affirmed, 'never stood more firmly or more securely than it does at the present time.' And so, though the subject of Prayer Book revision was raised in Parliament and elsewhere time and again, nothing was to come of it save the Amended Subscription Act of 1865 — an Act, of course, which benefited the clergy alone. It is pitiable to read the trite objections by which revision was opposed. To remove anything from the Prayer Book was to mutilate it. Excision, it was said, must leave

[4] Hildyard describes how he was present at St. George's on one occasion and gives a painfully interesting account of the coughing, hooting and hissing which punctuated the service; of the police escorting the clergy and choir down the aisle; of the newspaper reporters closing up their notebooks and hurrying away as if from a public meeting.

[5] He became Bishop of Durham in the same year (1860) and died in 1861.

permanent scar; whilst 'This is not the time' was the favourite dy of all.

'Has there ever been a time,' Hildyard enquires, 'from the days of Luther to the moment at which we have now arrived, when such has not been the watchword of anti-Reformers? At this present time! Why, if the thing is worth doing at all, no time like the present. If the thing is *not* worthy of being done, then the time can never come that shall make it so' (I, pp. 57-8).

'Far seeing men,' he observes, 'anticipate a coming struggle between the advocates of the *letter* and the advocates of the *spirit* of the Prayer-book; and taking counsel from all history, they think it more prudent to meet the danger half-way, than to shut their eyes to its approach, and allow the enemy to gain strength by delay' (I, p. 209).

But far-seeing men are seldom very numerous, and the danger s apparent only to a few. The rest were either blind to its istence or else raised 'The Church in danger' cry against the visionist movement. And so the *Ingoldsby Letters* remain as e all too unheeded voice of one crying in the wilderness — 'the idulous grasshopper that sits up aloft,' as the eloquent Soapy m once expressed it in the House of Lords, pointing up as he d so to where Hildyard was sitting in the strangers' gallery ring one of the fruitless Parliamentary revisionist debates.

'This haughty and overbearing prelate,' comments the Grasshopper, 'little dreamt of being stung in the heel by such a miserable worm as a poor country parson. . . . At the same time there may be no harm in reminding his Lordship, in passing, that his dictatorship does not as yet extend beyond the limits of his own diocese; and that the harmless little animal will still continue to chirp in its obscurity, unawed by the frowns or threats of the would-be Laud of the universal Church' (II, p. 151).

Certainly it was not the least of Hildyard's merits that he ld maintain an unpopular point of view so steadily and refuse swim with the ecclesiastical stream. Another instance of this is criticism of Convocation revived in the Southern Province in 53 but prevented from meeting in York by Archbishop sgrave until his death seven years later.

'While no one,' says Hildyard, 'would acquiesce more readily than I should in any decision of the *National* Legislature, consisting of the Queen, Lords, and Commons, I cannot help protesting against the attempted revival, at this period of the world's history, of a *Church* Legislature, an *imperium in imperio*, an exclusive jurisdiction of equals over equals; or at best a class legislation, where the absence of the voice of the laity renders all opinion one-sided, to say the least of it, if not narrow and intolerant' (I, p. 2).

It was, he thought, in 1858, a nine days wonder; or rather, opting the Italian version of the proverb, a *three* days' wonder at being the length of time for which Convocation has just been

sitting), 'and, sooth to say, quite enough of so good a thing as CONVOCATION has *hitherto* proved itself to be' (I, p. 6).[6]

The Letters also contain two amusing accounts of proctorial elections in the Lincoln diocese. At the first of these all the clergy, about one thousand in number, were required to assemble at Lincoln on a day stated for the purpose. About one hundred in fact presented themselves. The Registrar then pronounced 'sentence of contumacy' on the absent nine hundred, and the 'election' proceeded. 'A more complete burlesque of the word,' Hildyard comments, 'can hardly be imagined.'

On another occasion, in 1867, he himself stood as a candidate for election. That he did so unsuccessfully hardly needs to be said. His opponent was one of the cathedral clergy, and as the electors had once again to vote in person, he had an obvious and distinct advantage over Hildyard, whose parish is some forty miles from Lincoln. Moreover,

> 'The polling was carried on in the Chapter House of the Cathedral, at a table, *immediately in front of the presiding Bishop,* supported by his Archdeacons, Chaplains, Secretary, &c., &c., who thus in a manner over looked (if not overawed) each individual elector, as he came forward to write his name in a book prepared beforehand for the purpose' (II, p. 357).

Hildyard also recounts the tale of a Minor Canon whose vote was solicited on his (Hildyard's) behalf. The Minor Canon replied, 'Oh, I can't do that; I know nothing of him; *and we dine, you know, with the other man!*'

Even in those days, it seems, forms and questionnaires were beginning to be tiresome. One of these, sent by the Bishop of Lincoln in 1872, asking for details about church services and parochial organisations, drew from the Rector of Ingoldsby a vigorous protest. Admittedly there were advantages to be gained from statistical reports, but, he asks—surely with greater wisdom than he knew—to what lengths would the process eventually be carried?

Not only do the *Letters* give an account of the riots at St. George's in the East; they also contain an interesting description of a service at Spurgeon's Tabernacle, attended, so Hildyard estimates, by some five thousand people. 'Let us Spurgeonise the Church' is the bold advice that he gives in consequence. He pleads, that is to say, for more flexibility and a greater simplicity in our Prayer Book services.

> 'Let us not be ashamed,' he urges, 'to take a leaf here out of the enemy's book. Let us be content to be provoked to jealousy by them that

[6] Dean Hook on being asked why he never attended Convocation, replied, 'He was busy about his book, and had no time for trifling' (*I.L.*, II, p. 80).

are no church, and angered into a laudable emulation by those whom we are pleased to call "a foolish people." Let us beware lest the compliment be returned upon us with interest. . . . True wisdom should incline us to accommodate our manner to the tastes, or even, if it be so, to the weaknesses of our people, so long as truth is not hazarded or the full teaching of the Gospel witheld. Our business is, surely, to catch souls; and we must catch them as we *can*, if this may not be done as we would' (II, pp. 297-8).

Hildyard is still remembered to-day in the neighbourhood of oldsby by a few elderly folk, chiefly as a stern pastor, a magiste as well as a clergyman, who ruled his flock with a strong nd. This may have been the case, but in the *Letters* he appears an accomplished scholar and a penetrating wit, and as a loyal of the Church of England — all the more so because he so ently desired reform. If he was protestant in temper it was ause he was catholic in the comprehensiveness that he desired.

'I plead guilty,' he confesses, 'to thinking the Liturgy of our Church screwed full "high" enough already; and have no sympathy with those who would continually tighten her cords, and straiten her stakes, to the repelling of thousands who might be disposed to enter within her pale. True policy would recommend comprehension, rather than exclusion; true charity would aim at embracing the largest possible number within the bounds of the Church' (I, p. 48).

AN UNRECOGNISED FACTOR IN NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM

MANY readers of the New Testament in its English version may have noticed the frequent recurrence of paragraphs of apparently the same size. If one examines the Greek text of such paragraphs they are all found to be hovering around a standard of about 1,000 letters. Now, Scrivener in his *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* says:

> 'The Greeks and Romans measured their manuscripts by lines, not merely in poetry, but also artificially in prose, for a standard line of 15 or 16 syllables, called by the earliest writers an *epos*, afterwards *stichos*.'

Dr. Rendel Harris discussed this problem in his monograph *Stichometry*, and in *New Testament Autographs*, showing that the *stichos* was a line equivalent in length to a hexameter. In considering whether the line was measured by letters or syllables he suggests the likelihood of a primitive letter-measurement changing in course of time to a syllabic-measurement. However, he quotes Michaelis to this effect:

> 'Stichoi were only lines that contained a certain number of letters, and therefore often broke off in the middle of a word.'

He also quotes the researches of M. Graux, who gives evidence that copyists were paid at a fixed rate per 100 lines, and pointing out that such a law would be valueless unless the exact length of lines was a recognized fact, goes on to estimate the numbers of letters in various works, sacred and profane, dividing the totals by the number of *stichoi* which their MSS. declare them to contain, and he arrives at the result that they include between 35 and 38 letters to the *stichos*, and concludes that 36 letters would be the norm — which again is the norm of letters in the hexameter. My own view is that it would be more natural to suppose that, while the verse was of necessity founded on a syllabic basis, prose lines would be written on a letter basis. The analysis which I have made, over a long period of years, of all the New Testament writings and much other Greek prose, leads me to predicate the very great probability — indeed, to my mind, the certainty — of a *letter-* (not *syllabic-*) measurement for the *stichos*.

I judge this typical New Testament paragraph, therefore, to be a stichometrical unit of 28 lines, each containing 36 letters, *i.e.* a '1,008 letter page,' as I will call it. I submit that the fashion of Greek prose writers was to compose their works in a series of such 'pages,' each one a self-contained unit. My research has shown that all major works are normally comprised in multiples

of ten such units. (In actual MSS. the unit may have been split into two columns of 18-letter lines, or three of 12-letter lines, since narrower columns seem to have been adopted as easier for reading; but this does not affect the *unit of composition*.)

Sir Frederick Kenyon asserts that the Papyrus book-roll would usually not exceed 35 feet in length, *e.g.* the length of St. Luke's Gospel. My analysis of *Luke* shows this to be comprised of 90 page-units, which would appear to be a standard size very generally adopted for large works. Herodotus, for instance, works out at ten books of the same size as *Luke*. Similarly, Josephus in his *Jewish Wars* and *Antiquities* uses the 90-page book, as does Xenophon in his *Cyropaedia*. His *Memorabilia*, however, is an 80-page book — the same size as our *Matthew*; *Against Apion* of Josephus consists of two books of 60 pages each —the same size as the Fourth Gospel. Large works are apparently always in multiples of ten: *Mark* has 50 pages (the last partly torn off); the *Apocalypse of St. John* has 40 pages; *Romans* and I *Corinthians* run to 30.

A Greek prose writer, therefore, seems to have set about his work almost as a modern poet would construct a sonnet-sequence. To us, with our modern habit of flowing script, heedless of the precise page-divisions into which the printed copy will fall, such a theory may at first glance seem fantastic. But it is arguable that authorship was a much more deliberate operation in earlier times, and needed something of the dexterity of the compositor. It would not be difficult for an author to arrange the columns on his wax tablets till he had them ready for transcription on to papyrus or parchment roll. However that may be, the further my research has gone the more evidence has accumulated of the undeniable occurrence of the 1,008-letter unit with a frequency very difficult to explain on accidental grounds. The precise regularity of composition thus envisaged is not without modern parallel: *e.g.* in Forster's *Life of Dickens* one reads that

> 'not the least remarkable feature in all his MSS. is the accuracy with which the portions of each representing the several numbers are exactly adjusted to the space the printer has to fill. Whether without erasure or so interlined as to be illegible, nothing is wanting, and nothing is in excess.'

No doubt the experience of Dickens as a journalist facilitated his achievement.

The stichometrical analysis as thus defined and applied exposes the fact that many ancient writings have been heavily glossed by copyists.

The New Testament books fully share this characteristic. Let any reader open Westcott-Hort's Greek Testament at the very first page, which contains the beginning of the genealogy of Jesus. Westcott-Hort arranges this genealogy, as I believe the original autograph did, with each generation occupying a single short line. When thus arranged the glosses at the end of certain lines hit the eye immediately — phrases like 'and his brethren,' 'of Ruth,' 'the king,' etc., which are not integral parts of the genealogy at all, but mere marginal notes. That the same sort of thing happened everywhere else, though not visually apparent, is arguable from the very first line of this page, which is a perfect *stichos* of 36 letters, glossed by the addition of 'son of Abraham.' This latter phrase is not a title of our Lord like 'Son of David.' It is never so used. In view of the fact that the genealogy traces his descent from Abraham, it is not very surprising that someone should have added this little gloss to the first line, just as others were added below. It is just as certainly a gloss as, *e.g.* 'of Ruth'; and the special visibility of the latter is merely due to the unusual arrangement of the column, not in full *stichoi*, but in shorter lines.

I should also note that after the opening *stichos* there follow 27 steps in the genealogy down to verse 11, which would bring us to the foot of the first column in Matthew's autograph. It is just here, at the bottom of the column, that we get the more extended gloss — 'and his brethren at the time of the carrying away into Babylon'; with a corresponding gloss at the top of the next column — 'and after the carrying off into Babylon.' This, so far forth, may be taken to point to the correctness of my assumption of the 28-line column as the structural unit.

But what I am for the moment concerned to emphasize is the fact that on the first page of *Matthew* there are no less than eight distinct glosses; small and unimportant, indeed, but there they are. If the first page of the New Testament has been liberally peppered with them, it would be surprising if there were not a plentiful sprinkling of them elsewhere. And indeed there is. Unglossed pages are in a decided minority.

That there was a bad mishandling of the New Testament writings in the second century (before they came to be regarded as holy scripture, and brought together in the Canon) is witnessed by Origen, as quoted in Nestle's *Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, who complains of the evil condition of the MSS. of the New Testament writings of his day:

> 'Undoubtedly there is much variation in the copies, either through the carelessness of certain scribes, or from the evil recklessness of some

revisers, who put into or take away from the text what seems good to themselves.'

Nestle also refers, as also does Scrivener in his *Introduction*, to Eusebius's quotation of a letter from Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, to the Church at Rome, in which he says:

> 'When Christians asked me to write letters I wrote them, and the apostles of the devil have filled them with tares, by leaving out some things and putting in others. But woe awaits them. Therefore it is no wonder that some have gone about to falsify even the scriptures of the Lord, when they have plotted against writings so inferior.'

Other witnesses might be quoted to the same effect.

In this matter of glossing, however, the New Testament books have not suffered more than others; there is frequent glossing everywhere. Indeed, it seems to have been a characteristic feature of any books current before the era of printing. For example, in Ingram's introduction to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Everyman ed.) he says of Nennius:

> 'The work ascribed to him is so full of interpolations and corruptions introduced by his transcribers . . . that it is difficult to say how much of this motley production is original and authentic.'

As regards the New Testament, Sir Frederick Kenyon has noted that in periods of persecution it was the official copies of scripture preserved in churches which would most likely be destroyed; private copies would escape more easily. And:

> 'It was inevitable that the scriptures should be much corrupted during these early centuries when . . . copies made by private individuals for their own use played an important part in the textual tradition.'

Private copies were, no doubt, most likely to be annotated copies.

This brief preliminary discussion of the subject must suffice here and now. For I propose in the rest of this article to indicate some of the evidence for my thesis yielded by the New Testament writings.

(1) To begin with, as illustrations of the page-unit as it stands in the current text and taking *Mark* alone into consideration, we have i, 14-26 (1,010 letters); i, 27-39 (989 letters); ii, 1-12 (1,005 letters); iv, 35-v, 5 (1,000 letters); viii, 1-13 (998 letters); viii, 31-ix, 1 (999 letters); x, 17-27 (1,005 letters); xii, 1-12 (1,010 letters); xii, 28-37 (1,001 letters); xiv, 40-52 (1,001 letters); xv, 1-20a (1,009 letters); and all these sections are easily conformed to the exact norm of 1,008 letters by the adoption of trifling *textant* variants. (My enumerations are all from Nestle's 1904 edition.) And this is particularly striking. After I had analysed *Mark* it occurred to me to tot up the letters of the editorial

appendix (xvi, 9-20). In Nestle it stands at 985 letters, but Nestle omits 8 letters in verse 14 and 15 letters in verse 18 which are included in Westcott-Hort. On the contrary, Westcott-Hort stands at 998 letters, but omits 10 letters in verse 17 which are included by Nestle. So the writer has not attempted to fill the broken last page of *Mark*, but has added a page of precisely the size assumed in my analysis. That is surely strong evidence of the *normality* of this unit of composition.

(2) In *Mark* i, 2-13 (verse 1 being a general heading) we get the proper page if we delete '*in the prophet Isaiah*,' an uncertain reading, in verse 2. The clause seems to be a careless marginal note, corrected in some MSS. to '*in the prophets*.' Again, in *Mark* ii, 23 - iii, 6 we get the exact page if we delete in verse 26 'when Abiathar was high-priest,' which is surely a likely enough marginal note.

Of more importance are the following: *Luke* ii, 1-14 is an exact page if we delete the bracketed verse 2 with its very dubious historical accuracy: (R.V.) 'This was the first enrolment when Quirinius was governor of Syria.' In *Acts* xxvii, 21-32 we get the page if we eliminate verse 26, which is surely open to grave suspicion: (R.V.) 'howbeit we must be cast upon a certain island.' In *Romans* vi, 1-14 the deletion of verse 7 gives us the page: (R.V.) 'for he that hath died is justified from sin'; and similarly in vii, 1-11 the deletion of the last sentence in verse 3, 'so that she is no adulteress, though she be joined to another man.' Both the latter examples are likely glosses.

Again, in *Romans* xiii, 11 - xiv, 9 we need the deletion in verse 3 of 'for God hath received him.' In I *Cor.* xi, 2-16 we must delete verse 10 to get the page: (R.V.) 'For this cause ought the woman to have a sign of authority on her head, because of the angels.' The verse apparently refers to a rabbinical notion that demons entered the head through the ear; and one would hesitate to credit Paul with such a superstition. In *John* vii, 14-27 we must delete the bracket in verse 22 for the exact page: '(not that it is of Moses, but of the fathers)'; and in *John* xi, 17-31 the deletion of verse 18 — a quite likely gloss — gives us the correct page: (R.V.) 'Now Bethany was nigh unto Jerusalem, about fifteen furlongs off.'

(3) I pass on to a few examples of more extended glossing which confuse, or even distinctly pervert, the original text. Here, for example, is a hugely swollen page, standing at no less than 1,497 letters — *Romans* i, 18-32. Yet it instantly resolves itself, if we delete verses 23-24 and verses 26-27, the redundancy

of which is obvious, and then, with Scrivener, add 'implacable' in verse 31, you are faced with exactly 1,008 letters.

Here is another example of perversion in *Mt.* xxi, 1-14, where the deletion of verse 13 brings us to the verge of a correct page, and a couple of slight variants settle it. And verse 13 is logically, as well as stichometrically impossible; for the king in the parable could not cast a man into 'outer darkness'—a synonym for spiritual damnation. It is a clumsy commentator's notion of what the parable implies that God would do. But it is utterly inept as describing the king's action. Nor is it needed: the 'and he was speechless' is a perfectly adequate finish. Once again, in the parable of the Good Samaritan: *Lk.* x, 25-37, the real answer to 'Who is my neighbour?' is 'Anyone who stands in need of your help.' But verses 36-37a twist it round the other way, and answer the query 'Who is a good neighbour to another man?'

(4) And this leads me to a further line of evidence suggested by sections which have this common feature, that they are all marked by some disputed clause, and the adoption or rejection of this clause, as the case may be, at once yields the exact page-unit.

For example, *Mt.* xix, 27 - xx, 7. Here Nestle, in common with Westcott-Hort, omits from verse 7 the closing phrase 'and he shall receive what is just,' which Scrivener includes. But the section stands at 985 letters, and the omitted phrase adds precisely the 23 letters more required to bring the page to the exact form. And the clause is intrinsically probable.

Similarly in *Mk.* viii, 14-36, we need to add the clause 'nor tell it to any in the village,' again an intrinsically probable clause, though rejected by Nestle and Westcott-Hort. And again in *Romans* x, 16 - xi, 6 the acceptance in verse 6 of the clause (A.V.) 'But if it be of works, then it is no more of grace: otherwise work is no more work,' just fills the lacuna to make an exact page.

In *Mt.* xxvii, 27-38 we must similarly resume the quotation in verse 34 which Nestle and Westcott-Hort reject. But in *Lk.* xxii, 39-53 the verses 43-44 are shown by the stichometry to be intrusive:

> (A.V.) '42 saying: Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done. 43: And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him. 44: And being in agony he prayed more earnestly; and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground. 45: And when he rose from prayer, and was come to his disciples, he found them sleeping for sorrow, 46: and said unto them, Why sleep ye? rise and pray, lest ye enter into temptation.'

Intrusive also is the last clause of verse 51, 'and he touched his ear, and healed him.'

(5) I conclude with examples of the value of stichometry in dealing with displacements in the text. *Mt.* xxiii, for example, obviously cannot stand *after* the arrival at Jerusalem. And *Luke* x occurs at far too early a point in the narrative, and so on. In *John* x, in the midst of a discourse about the Good Shepherd, we are suddenly confronted with verses 22-23, which jerk us on to the feast of Dedication, whereas we have presumably been at the feast of Tabernacles. After this intrusion the discourse of the Good Shepherd is resumed. But if we transfer these verses to the start of chapter ix, then this whole section is separated from chapters vii-viii, which are associated with Tabernacles. And the section ix, 1-12 is incomplete, but is easily adjusted to the norm if we place these dislocated verses at the opening. That then appears to be their true place.

Lack of space compels me to omit many more illustrations, but such as I have here given may serve, I hope, to provoke readers to further enquiry and research in the sphere of stichometrical analysis.

LEWIS JOHNSON

THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

By the REV. T. J. WOOD, M.A., Hon. Sec. of M.C.U.

THE International Association for Religious Freedom came into being through the efforts of Dr. Charles W. Wendte, an American Unitarian minister, who sought to draw together Unitarian and other liberal religious thinkers throughout the world. Founded in 1900, with a strong Unitarian basis, it has become catholic enough to omit the word Unitarian from its original title, and is now called the International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom, or, more shortly, the I.A.R.F. To-day it includes in its membership not only the Unitarian Churches of England and the United States, but also liberal movements inside older, and often 'established,' Churches such as the Dutch Reformed Church. One of its most important members was the Czechoslovak Church, but that Church has now, of course, been cut off from contact with the West by the Iron Curtain.

Among recent groups to join the I.A.R.F. are the liberal wing of the German Lutheran Churches, the Deutscher Bund für freies Christentum, and the Deutscher Unitarier Bund. The most important contribution that liberal Churchmen in England can probably make to these movements on the Continent is to demonstrate how liberalism can be combined with membership in the older traditional Churches. Just as the existence of a national and established Church is practical evidence to the world of a great effort to reconcile national life and the Christian religion, so the comprehensive character of the Church of England is an example of tolerance and freedom which is all too lacking on the Continent.

The aim of the I.A.R.F. is to develop and strengthen liberal religious movements in whatever Church they may be found. Liberal Christianity has had a different history on the Continent and in Anglo-Saxon countries. The latter have a liberal tradition running through all departments of life and thought, and its existence is taken for granted. Liberalism on the Continent has had a harder struggle, and is still a minority movement whose future is uncertain. Liberal Churchmen in England, therefore, have some obligation to extend their sympathy and support to the work of the I.A.R.F. That task should not be left to the Unitarians, for the I.A.R.F. contains groups which are definitely not Unitarian.

The fear of Unitarianism has been greatly exaggerated. The trend of scholarship has softened the edges of doctrinal controversy, and the issues which led to the foundation of Unitarianism now seem less capable of sharp definition than formerly. It is true that since the last war there has been a tendency towards greater theological dogmatism in some circles, but the liberal must maintain at all costs that the results of modern scholarship cannot be by-passed in order to secure a dogmatic and aggressive orthodoxy. Such orthodoxy is always in danger of falling over into the opposite heresy to the one it seeks to denounce. Thus in their desire to exclude Unitarians from the World Council of Churches that Council has fallen into the opposite heresy in laying down as its basis the formula 'Jesus Christ as God and Saviour.' Modern Churchmen should do their utmost to have that formula revised, not in the interest of Unitarian Churches which it excludes, but in that of historical and rational Christianity.

The controversial minutiae of Christological doctrine seem insignificant and irrelevant in the face of the vast world issues to-day and the growing indifference of masses to the claims of religion. These things constitute a far more serious and dangerous challenge to Christian values than any tinge of heresy in a

few Christians. The danger of totalitarianism in England or America may seem very remote, but to the Churches on the Continent it is immediate and real. That is why the I.A.R.F. has taken as the subject for its Conference at Oxford this year *Authority and Freedom in the Modern World*.

On this issue the attitude of all liberal Churchmen cannot be in doubt, and the I.A.R.F. has the right to look to all such in England for their interest and support in bringing the need to defend freedom in religion, as in politics, home to the minds and consciences of Christians.

The Conference to be held in Oxford from August 12 to 17 will be truly international in character and in its interests. Among the speakers will be the Rt. Hon. J. Chuter Ede, the Rev. A. Victor Murray, Principal of Cheshunt College, Cambridge, and Professor van Holk of Leyden, who spent three years in a German hostage camp. America will be represented by Dr. Luther Adams (Chicago) and the Rev. Ernest Kuebler of Boston; Germany by Professor Heiler of Marburg, and Switzerland by Professor Buri of Basle.

Among the subjects at the evening meetings will be 'The Threat to Freedom by Authoritarian Powers' and 'The Authority of the Free Spirit.' The morning sessions will be devoted to sectional meetings on sociology, theology, religious education, and science and religion. The last will be led by Professor Stratton of Cambridge. There will therefore be plenty of opportunities for the discussion of the problem of freedom in all its aspects, and English people will benefit from hearing how the problem strikes members of other nations and of other Churches.

This opportunity of making international contacts and of displaying the sympathy and interest of English religious liberalism should not be neglected by members of the Modern Churchmen's Union. The Secretary of the Conference is Miss F. Chapman, 5 Mackenzie Road, Cambridge, from whom further particulars can be obtained.

THE FAITH FOR THE WORLD'S NEED

By Raymond C. Knox, S.T.D.

The following article had been already set up in type for publication in this issue of the *Modern Churchman* when we learned with deep regret that its distinguished author had passed away. Dr. Knox as Dean for more than twenty years of Columbia University, U.S.A., exercised a powerful Christian influence in that important educational centre. He was a devoted member of the Modern Churchmen's Union and did all in his power to promote its principles in American Church life.

THE world in which we live is urgently in need of an inspiring, invigorating and a sustaining faith. A conspicuous sign of our me is that people in many lands, especially in Western civiliza- on, have become aware that to have a firm-founded, vital faith s a foremost necessity. The tragic years of two world-wars with ailure to lead to permanent peace; the threat of Communism to reedom and genuine democracy; the grim issues and huge tasks o be met affecting the destiny of mankind; the question whether ne enormous power which science has put into men's hands will e used for 'atomic extinction' or solely for human welfare; a ense of the insecurity of life and a darkening fear of what the uture may bring — all these conditions are causing us to examine fresh the basic convictions upon which our life depends and to ealize that we must have a reasonable, victorious faith.

When Jesus began his public ministry in Galilee he announced t once, 'The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at and; repent, and believe in the good news' (Gospel) (*Mk.* i, 15). nd the Kingdom was the subject of which he continued to speak herever he went and to all sorts of people. All of his sayings nd parables are to teach or to illustrate its true nature. The King- om was the foremost purpose for which he bade men to pray and o strive. He trained a company of disciples by close association ith himself to carry on the work of the Kingdom.

The Kingdom of God was the good news when Jesus first pro- laimed it, and it is equally the good news for our age. But to ealize why the Kingdom is for us the good news, how faith in it neets our deepest need, what serving the Kingdom means, we ust have a clear understanding of the Kingdom in terms intel- gible to present-day thought and experience. The following resentation has this as its aim. My intention is not to discuss here ne varying, sometimes conflicting, views of specialists, which, owever valuable, often 'give an uncertain sound.'

I

While the Kingdom is God's rule with righteous, life-yielding laws which are to be obeyed, God in the teaching of Jesus is not an almighty monarch who arbitrarily imposes His will on His subjects; He is the loving Father who would have our affection and trust, and that we should intelligently know and gladly do His will.

Because God is Father, all men are to live together as brothers. The brotherhood of man has no basis, and as a phrase does not make sense, apart from the Fatherhood of God. The two great commandments which Jesus combined, love of God and love of neighbour (inclusive of all men), are inseparable.

II

Not only did Jesus teach the Kingdom; in his life and deeds he embodied it. He actually founded it on earth. 'He did not predict it, he began it. He inaugurated it, and undertook to carry out the greatest task ever conceived — to set up the Kingdom of God on earth.'[2]

The Kingdom begun on earth in the life of Jesus is not to be thought of as then first having existence. Rather as God's will and eternal purpose it was and is always existent. The spiritual realm of God's reign and purpose, in which all truth and the highest values of life have their source and validity, the Kingdom is the supreme, eternal reality in the universe. What Jesus did and ever sought to do was to awaken men's minds to see it and to arouse their wills to live in accord with its higher laws and and standards.

Thus Jesus declared, 'The Kingdom of God is at hand' (*Mk.* i, 15); *it is an ever-present reality*. We do not have to wait for it until some future time when, as is often said, 'conditions are different,' nor think of it as only in another world to be entered after life here is ended, though that is included. The Kingdom can be entered here and now whenever we open the eyes of our mind to see its truth and resolve to bring our wills into conformity with it. To seek the Kingdom, to realize it even more fully in daily living, ought to be the foremost aim in everything we do. The Kingdom of God is to be sought *first* — not left to a margin

[1] The Kingdom of heaven used in the Gospel according to *Matthew* has the same meaning as the Kingdom of God in *Mark* and *Luke*.

[2] *A Life of Jesus*, by Edgar J. Goodspeed, p. 64 (Harper and Brothers, 1950); a book highly recommended.

r segment of time and interest — and then all necessary material things, being gained and used aright, 'shall be added thereto' (*Mt.* vi, 33).

III

What are the requirements for entering the Kingdom? Two re specifically named in Jesus' opening announcement of the Kingdom at hand, and the others can be unmistakably learned rom his teaching and life.

(1) *The first is to repent*: the literal meaning of to repent, and he sense in which Jesus used it, is to change one's mind for the etter, always with the implication that action is to be in accord. t has not the limited reference only to those who have committed ome immoral act which they are to resolve not to do again. As esus specified it, to repent is equally necessary for everyone. And e repeatedly stressed it as required of those who felt they had no eed to repent, namely, of the Pharisees. They considered themelves to be the upholders of true religion, the defenders of rthodoxy, for did they not strictly observe all the detailed duties nd ceremonies of the Mosaic Law? But because they were unilling to change their minds for the better they failed to see the ew and higher truth of the Kingdom as inaugurated and taught y Jesus. They did not enter the Kingdom themselves and they indered other people from entering (*Mt.* xxiii, 13).

That the Kingdom may be more fully realized on earth in our ay the first requisite is to repent, to advance to new and truer ays of thinking and to live consistently with this conviction. When thinking is static, setting itself in opposition to larger knowedge, it sins against the Holy Spirit, whose creative activity is ver seeking to lead men into all truth (*John* xvi, 12, 13).

If Lincoln could say in his time, 'The dogmas of the quiet ast are inadequate for the stormy present,' how far more forcibly o his words apply to our time with its world-wide problems and nprecedented tasks! The preamble to the constitution of UNESCO[3] reads, 'Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is n the minds of men that the defences of peace must be conructed.' When the new way of thinking required by the Kingom of God is in the minds of men, the evil of war and many ther evils will be overcome and a new age of peaceful co-operation nd achievement will dawn.

(2) *Believe, have faith in the good news.* A man's faith always etermines what he does. It gives the pattern to his life and the

[3] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

values held highest to be the goal of his endeavours. So Jesus named faith in the Kingdom as the second requirement equally necessary with repentance. To have faith in the Kingdom signifies that its values and standards are recognized as highest, the end to which one's life is to be devoted, the 'pearl of great price,' the treasure for which he would gladly give his all (*Mt.* xiii, 44-46).

> 'The most distinctive mark of genuine faith is its creative power.[4] It can create and bring into the world the new and more excellent way of living which is not now outwardly seen because it is not practised, but if our aims and wills are in accord with God's purpose and laws, can be practised and made visible. . . . Above all and through all, faith of creative power is in God. . . . For faith is the complete devotion to God and His purpose revealed in the life of Christ which makes our lives one in spirit and will with Him. By this closest bond of union with Him our lives are thereby opened to the Supreme Source of spiritual power and are immeasurably renewed and strengthend. . . . And it is His power working in and through us wherein is the assurance of ultimate triumph.'

As Lionel Curtis has stated:

> 'The great difficulty lies in moving from one stage to another. It consists no longer in physical obstacles, but only in human minds. It is mountainous in size, and as such can only be removed by faith' (*Civitas Dei,* Vol. III, p. 126).

The fact that to repent and to have faith are personal, spiritual requirements makes plain that the Kingdom in human life has its radiating centre in the inner life of men. This is the profound truth pointed out by Jesus to the Pharisees who were looking for some spectacular, outward sign of the coming Kingdom. But, Jesus declared, the Kingdom is not coming with signs that can be seen, 'for behold, the Kingdom of God is within you' (*Lk.* xvii, 20, 21). 'The Kingdom must be "within" before it can be "without."'[5] 'Make the tree good,' and it will bear 'good fruit' (*Mt.* vii, 18; xii, 33).

With this primary necessity of having the Kingdom within, Jesus was no less insistent that the evidence of its presence is in what men do.

(3) *The test of deeds.* Here we have many direct sayings of Jesus: 'By their fruits you shall know them' (*Mt.* vii, 20); 'Not every man who says to me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of heaven, but he that does the will of my Father who is in heaven' (*Mt.* xii, 21; cf. parable, *Mt.* vii, 24-27). To do the will

[4] The quoted sentences are from the writer's article, 'The Creative Energy of Faith' in the *Modern Churchman,* March, 1951.

[5] *The Eternal Kingdom,* by C. J. Wright, p. 90 (James Clarke & Co.). See also another excellent small book, *Basic Christianity,* by H. D. A. Major (Basil Blackwell, Oxford).

of God, Jesus affirmed to be a closer bond of kinship to him than any physical relationship — 'For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother and sister and mother' (*Mk.* iii, 31-35 and parallels).

(4) *The new standard of greatness.* Deeds are to be the evidence of the Kingdom within, but of what kind? The answer of Jesus is again plainly given. In contrast to the so-called great ones of the earth who lord it over people, he warned his disciples, 'so shall it not be among you; but whosoever would be great among you shall be your servant. For the Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve,' even to the sacrifice of his life (*Mk.* x, 35-45 and parallels).

Democracy is now threatened as never before; even the word is falsified and deceitfully used by those who totally destroy personal freedom and human rights. The defenders of democracy must clearly know its true character and so be able resolutely to uphold it. For this cause the necessity for recognizing and practising the Kingdom standard of unselfish service cannot be overemphasized.

> 'We are in the habit of saying that democracy demands intelligence,' wrote the late Dr. Arthur McGiffert,[6] 'that it does not work well among ignorant or backward peoples. But we have failed to see that it demands also unselfishness. . . . Democracy means liberty, but liberty is dangerous unless it be permeated by the spirit of service. . . . Democracy is safe, even though it is not perfect, so long as there is enough unselfishness in it to counteract the distintegrating forces of mere self-interest. . . . To make it human instead of mechanical, to put love and sympathy and the desire to serve in place of indifference and jealousy and greed of personal gain and power — this is Christianity's great duty to the democracy of to-day and to-morrow.'

IV

The Coming Kingdom. The Kingdom of God to come on earth is the reign of the spirit and purpose of God, as Jesus embodied and taught, in the hearts and lives of men and expressed and made dominant in all human affairs, relationships, activities and institutions.

This Kingdom, actually begun on earth in the life of Jesus, has in it, as he well knew and declared, the power of life and growth. He likened it to a grain of mustard seed, 'the smallest of all the seeds' sown by the farmer, yet grows into a tree with great spreading branches. Jesus also compared it to leaven which a

[6] 'Christianity and Democracy,' by Arthur Cushman McGiffert, formerly President of Union Theological Seminary, in *The Harvard Theological Review*, January, 1919.

woman hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened (*Mt.* xiii, 31-33). Compare also the parable of the sower casting seed, some of which fell on good ground and brought forth an *abundant* harvest (*Mt.* iv, 1-9). And he trained a group of disciples who as they learned about the Kingdom were sent out to extend it.

Wherever there are men and women, individually and associated, whole-heartedly devoted to do the will of God learnt from Jesus, consistently expressing it in service to life measured by his standard — there the Kingdom comes with growing power. That the Kingdom will come to triumphant power is sure, for it is God's will.

There are passages in the Gospels which read as they stand (*Mk.* xiii; *Mt.* xxiv, 44; *Lk.* xxi, 5-36) seem to show that Jesus expected the Kingdom would come in the near future by God's intervention, taking the form of a world-catastrophe. This apocalyptic belief was widely held at the time the Gospels were written and it is undoubtedly incorporated through a misunderstanding of some of the sayings of Jesus. For though he may have used at times the symbolic language of apocalyptic writings, his thought was quite different. In the words of Dr. Goodspeed :

> 'Jesus was well aware that God's violent triumph through an apocalyptic judgment would not be the noblest triumph of God's cause; its noblest triumph would be won only through winning the hearts of men to the will of God.' [7]

The methods of its advance are various. Jesus therefore urged men ceaselessly to watch, to be prepared and ready to advance the Kingdom. For his message to every age is the same as it was when he first proclaimed it: The Kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe — have faith — in the good news!

How important that the good news of the Kingdom should be made known to-day to meet the deepest needs of the world in which we live! Devotion to the Kingdom means for each individual the fullest realization of life. It is the message for the Churches to proclaim and teach, which would bring them into effective co-operation, each contributing its best to the common end. As the great, over-arching purpose of God for all nations to serve is realized, it would inspire and strengthen them to work harmoniously together for justice, freedom, brotherhood and enduring peace — and His will must be done!

[7] *A Life of Jesus*, p. 127.

A LAYMAN'S READING

By John Rowland, B.Sc.

IT does not always follow that the most expensive book to be published within a given period is at the same time the most important book; but I am fairly sure that the most expensive new book which I have to notice this time is the most important of them all. It is Mr. John Armour's *The Story of Christianity* (Williams & Norgate; 25*s*.). There is no indication anywhere in the volume of Mr. Armour's qualifications for undertaking this task of describing in one massive book the whole long and involved story of the rise of the Christian religion, and of surveying the present position of the various Christian Churches. But he has provided in this volume of some 400 pages a wider and more impartial account of Christianity than is available, as far as I know, in any other similar volume. Mr. Armour's verdict on the existing Christian situation is worth noting:

> 'While the Roman Church has in recent years joined the chorus of those who are shouting for freedom, it must not be forgotten that the leaders of that Church are, in the main, opposed to democracy. It is for this reason that Protestants, as a general rule, refrain from joining with Roman Catholics in their crusade against Communism' (p. 388).

With it might well be read a reprint of a Pelican Book which has already achieved some success — Dr. Stanley Cook's *An Introduction to the Bible* (Penguin Books; 2*s*.). This, too, is a scholarly contribution which takes into full consideration the work of recent research workers on the many problems of Biblical origins.

Two other books which seem to ask to be read together are Mr. Kenneth Ingram's *Christianity, Communism, and Society* (Rider; 12*s*. 6*d*.) and Dr. R. J. McCracken's *Questions People Ask* (S.C.M. Press; 9*s*. 6*d*.). Mr. Ingram has previously written on the social message of the Gospel; this time, in spite of what some readers may feel to be a rather distressingly flippant style, he writes clearly on some of the political problems which beset religious thinkers in the twentieth century. Dr. McCracken is Dr. Fosdick's successor at Riverside Church, New York City, and this collection of his addresses is, apparently, his first book to be published in this country. It shows that he is a thoughtful preacher, and a man with a gift for making the eternal verities clear, without in any way losing sight of his modern background.

Different, I think, from any book I have ever mentioned in my periodic surveys here is *The Letters of Elizabeth Myers*, edited by her husband, Littleton C. Powys (Chapman & Hall;

18*s*.). Everyone acquainted with English fiction during the past ten years or so will know the name of Elizabeth Myers, who died, at the distressingly early age of 34, some five years ago. She only published three novels, but these showed that hers was a rare talent. Her letters show her as a woman of strikingly beautiful character, and as one to whom religious belief was a necessary part of any full life. She was a member of the Roman Catholic Church, but her Catholicism was all-embracing and not in any way restrictive, as it so often is. This is one of the most memorable and most touching volumes of recent years. 'To me,' says Elizabeth Myers in a characteristic phrase, 'religion is three words: "Love one another".'

It is difficult to decide what book can follow next, as that volume of letters is so striking and so individual in its approach. Perhaps the best is to make a complete contrast, such as is provided by Dr. C. E. Raven's *Science and the Christian Man* (S.C.M. Press; 4*s*. 6*d*.). This is a reprint of a series of talks delivered last year in the B.B.C. Home Service. The book is a worth-while contribution to the Christian interpretation of life. More specialized, but well worth reading (and more important than its price would indicate) is Dr. R. W. Wilde's *Psychology and Religious Faith* (Lindsey Press; 1*s*. 6*d*.). This is really just a booklet, but it goes a long way towards destroying the popular idea that psychology — and especially psycho-analysis — has in effect destroyed the spiritual basis of religion. Dr. Wilde is himself a psychologist, and knows his subject, which makes his defence of the religious outlook all the more impressive and all the more noteworthy.

Less directly of religious interest, though immediately important to those who would wish to understand the political background of some problems of personality and human development, is a rather frightening book, Senor Josué de Castro's *The Geography of Hunger* (Gollancz; 18*s*.). This is a survey, by an expert, of the way in which the food supplies of the world appear to be no longer sufficient to meet human needs. There is an introduction by Lord Boyd-Orr which is almost as frightening as the book itself. Here, indeed, and not in the international squabbles which 'hit the headlines,' is the real challenge of our time, a challenge which is fundamentally a religious matter as much as a directly political one.

On the scientific side perhaps the best book of the quarter which I am surveying is the rather oddly-titled *A Statue to Mr. Trattles*, by C. L. Boltz (Butterworth; 12*s*. 6*d*.). Mr. Trattles was an officer in the Merchant Navy who carried out a successful fight

ith the Board of Trade over the matter of colour-blindness. But e book does not deal only with this question; it deals also with any aspects of applied science as we see it in our day, and all in simple, easily-read style.

A much slighter book is Professor C. H. Dodd's *Christianity nd the Reconciliation of the Nations* (S.C.M. Press; 3*s.* 6*d.*). his is the Burge Memorial Lecture, delivered in London last ecember, and, like most printed lectures, it tends to raise more sues than it settles. But at the same time it is a useful book and ill stimulate thought on many fundamental questions of our time, specially on the international problems which feature so much in e thought of most serious-minded people.

An attempt at a serious assessment of such matters on an altoether bigger scale is Dr. A. S. Diamond's *The Evolution of Law nd Order* (Watts; 21*s.*). Dr. Diamond's earlier volume, *Primitive aw*, has been almost a classic of its subject for years past, and his new volume he has tried to bring the matter down to modern mes by working out the way in which conceptions of law have eveloped. He tends, however, to ignore the religious implicaons of the problem; he nowhere really faces the fact that in e twentieth century, during a period of religious decline, there as been a corresponding decline of respect for law, both personal nd international. Perhaps, as an interesting contrast to Dr. iamond's learned treatise, one should read another recent book, r. Charles Reith's *The Blind Eye of History* (Faber; 18*s.*), hich is a history of police forces and their work. It is in some spects controversial, but it contains a vast amount of informaon which is not otherwise readily accessible.

It might be worth recommending here a volume which has een regarded as valuable in the past, and which has recently een reissued. This is Dr. Mortimer Rowe's *A Golden Treasury f the Bible* (Lindsey Press; 9*s.* 6*d.*). It is, in effect, an anthology extracts from the Bible, so designed as to present its message early. The Synoptic Gospels, for instance, are run together so at a story which appears, in variant versions, in more than one ospel, is told in the fullest possible way in a continuous narrave. For the most part Dr. Rowe has taken what he regards as e best translation, combining the language of the Authorised nd Revised Versions; here and there, where he thinks both are in me way unsatisfactory (particularly in the Pauline Epistles), he as substituted a version of his own. But this book brings home ith considerable freshness many of the old ideas which had mehow faded into the background of thought with continual petition.

My surveys of serious literature in these pages usually seem to swing from one subject to another. Again I turn from religion to science, and recommend my cheapest book, Mr. S. G. Blaxland Stubbs's *From Magic to Modern Medicine* (Watts; 1*s.*). This is one of Messrs. Watts's amazingly cheap 'Thrift Books,' and gives in less than a hundred pages an account of the development of the science of healing from primitive times to the present day. It is necessarily much condensed, but at the same time it is quite impressive in its array of facts and theories. Mr. Stubbs, I think, is to be congratulated on doing a worth-while job, and on the skill with which it has been accomplished.

Back to religious questions once again, to devote a few lines to Bishop Stephen Neill's *Christian Partnership* (S.C.M. Press; 7*s.* 6*d.*). This is a good introduction to the way in which the various Churches in the various countries have tried, not altogether unsuccessfully, to work in harmony towards that end which all Churches, however different their emphases, must have in common. The volume is based on the James Long Lectures of the Church Missionary Society, delivered by Bishop Neill in 1950.

Finally, a work which is not a new book, but which has, I think, impressed me more in the reading than any of the new books of recent months. It may well have been noticed in these pages previously, but I do not apologize, if so, for dealing with it again, since a really stimulating book cannot be too often mentioned. It is Professor Herbert Butterfield's *Christianity and History* (Bell; 7*s.* 6*d.*), in which the Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge works out a philosophy of history, allowing room for his religious beliefs. It is a most impressive book which all Christians — and even more, all unbelievers — should read.

So we come full circle. I started with a book on the history of Christianity, and I am finishing with a book on the historical philosophy of a Christian. Contemporary secularism asserts that religion is dying, and that any kind of religious philosophy must be backward-looking and out-of-date. I think that the books with which I have been concerned here and now should be sufficient to disprove that statement. The time of anything like a full-scale revival of religion may, as yet, be far off; but that there is a stirring of ideas in religious circles such as has not been seen for many a long year seems to me to be quite certain.

BOOK REVIEWS

FIFTY YEARS OF ENGLISH SPEAKING RELIGION

A trio of outstanding students of Religion, Dr. Stephens Spinks, recently itor of the *Hibbert Journal*, Dr. E. L. Allen, an authority on the philo- hical and theological evolution of contemporary Western Christianity, Dr. nes Parkes, our most illuminating publicist on post-Biblical Judaism and Christian contacts, have united to produce a history of English speaking igion during the last fifty years. As a result of this triple alliance *Religion Britain since* 1900[1] escapes from the narrow partisanship which is the ilitating characteristic of so many essays in the field of modern ecclesi- ical history. Its most interesting themes are 'The Acids of Modernity,' he Churches and the Social Order,' 'The Stirring in the Universities,' 'The urches, the Arts and Contemporary Modes,' 'British Theology and Wider rizons,' 'British Theology and the Great Blight,' concluding with 'Britain, ristianity and the World.'

The volume opens with a brilliant picture of the last stage of the Victorian , followed by the brief *fin de siècle* of the Edwardian period — not unlike prosperity of the reign of Uzziah which preceded the Assyrian crisis. A *de siècle*, however, which constituted the prelude, not to a period of militating collapse, but to one in which 'mentally as well as politically nkind was on the march' (p. 48).

Ever since the publication of *The Origin of Species* (1859) and *Essays and views* (1860) in England; *La Vie de Jesus* (1863) and *Das Leben Jesu* (1864) the continent; traditional Christianity had been fighting an uphill battle d as a consequence various rivals to the Christian Religion began to claim blic attention in England—Comte's Positivism, T. H. Huxley's Agnos- ism, Mdme Blavtsky's Theosophy, Herbert Spencer's Synthetic Philosophy d last but not least Stanton Coit's Ethical Church. It is not surprising, erefore, that in the Edwardian period there was much philanthropy, much timism, much Biblical criticism and comparative study of religion but very le faith in Christian dogmatic theology and its ecclesiastical claims. Accord- g to the verdict of Dr. Spinks:

> 'It took two world wars to show that ethics divorced from metaphysics is insufficient to prevent men from serving something less worthy than their own best intentions.'

Dr. E. L. Allen in his masterly chapter entitled 'The Acids of Modernity' mmarises the religious situation as follows:

> 'In the course of the nineteenth century, however, the whole intellectual climate of Western Europe changed. God came to be sought, if at all, in the soul; historical study of the Bible invalidated it as a final court of appeal; the values of life, those of religion included, came to be sought within civilization instead of in the next world. Within Protestantism, at any rate, the whole trend was towards *immanentism*.'

With such a basis the door was opened wide to mystical religion and from ssued two immensely influential volumes—Dean Inge's *Christian Mysticism* d *Varieties of Religious Eperience* by Wm. James.

But united to Faith in Christian Mysticism was the conviction that a truer derstanding of the personality of Jesus and His Gospel, purged from

[1] *Religion in Britain since* 1900 by G. Stephens Spinks, M.A., Ph.D. *in collaboration h* E. L. Allen, M.A., Ph.D., D.D., and James Parkes, M.A., D.Phil., D.H.L. (Andrew kers. 18/-. 1952.)

accretions not simply mediaeval but primitive, would provide modern men and women with another sure foundation for their religious life. This led to the demand for 'the Gospel of Jesus' as distinguished from 'the Gospel about Jesus.' The religious situation appeared promising, but Liberal Christianity experienced a disastrous setback with the publication of Schweitzer's *Quest for the Historical Jesus* followed by Alfred Loisy's *L'Evangile, et l'eglise.* Before Schweitzer's appearance Harnack, 'the master of them that know,' in the immensely influential world of German Liberal Christianity

> 'had discarded the eschatology of the Gospels as husk, retaining their religious and ethical teaching as kernel.'

But for Schweitzer,

> 'eschatology was primary and ethics derivative. Jesus looked for a wholly future Kingdom to be brought in by a catastrophic divine intervention, and his ethic was one of self-denial and world-renunciation for the little time that remained' (p. 55).

Many were seduced from the Gospel of Liberal Christianity by the brilliancy of Schweitzer's volume, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede,* the crucial conclusions of which, so R. H. Charles, B. H. Streeter, Hastings Rashdall and other British Liberal scholars maintained, lacked an adequate basis of sound critical scholarship. Nevertheless, Roman Catholics, Anglo-Catholics and non-Catholics eagerly embraced Schweitzer's extreme conclusions (which it appears to-day from Schweitzer's latest statement, he no longer holds) to the great detriment of the advancement of a form of the Christian Religion which sought to unite mysticism and rationalism, enlightened ethics and large-minded toleration in the higher synthesis of an all-embracing Kingdom of God on earth—a spiritual, moral, social, economic, political civilization.

Augustine Birrell, the Victorian politician and man of letters, used to speak of 'the troublesome history of the Church of England.' How many and varied those troubles have been, called up by such headlines as non-miraculous Christianity, Kikuyu, *Foundations,* the Modernist movement, Form Criticism, the Deposited Book, the Doctrinal Report, South India! We cannot possibly deal with these church crises here. They were fights for truth, freedom and comprehensiveness in the Church of England, but, of course, they were to some extent fights in the dark as they are bound to be in an evolutionary universe. The attitude of the greatest of the Church's leaders in this vital period was one of masterly inactivity which had for its ideal 'Keep them all together': 'the longer it takes, the better it will be,' and above all: 'Peace in our time oh Lord.' Dr. Allen's acid comment is not without justification:

> 'But what capacity for leadership in an age of science can be credited to a Church which only knew how to persuade its crises to call again a year or so later?'

Perhaps during this period the brightest side of the Church's influence on the English people for good is to be found in three Movements.

(1) The Christian Social Movement originating with F. D. Maurice and his followers and carried forward in the twentieth century in more practical ways by Canon Barnett, Charles Jenkinson, Basil Jellicoe and not least by Wm. Temple with his Worker's Educational Association.

(2) The Student Christian Movement brought to England from U.S.A. in the person of Dr. J. R. Mott, whose motto was 'The World for Christ in one generation' and whose method of realization was 'Win the Universities to Christ and they will win the masses.'

To-day the S.C.M. is most influentially represented by Sir Walter Moberly, whose ideal Dr. James Parkes writes in his chapter on 'The Stirring in the iversities.'

'If the British universities are both to retain their academic freedom, and to strengthen the values set on human personality and a free society on which the western world rests, they need to re-examine their basis. The problem was already being raised before the war and was expressed with greater fullness by Sir Walter Moberley, once Vice-Chancellor of the University of Manchester, in his recent book: *The Crisis in the University*. He pleads that scholars and teachers cannot remain neutral, and that the universities need a definite philosophy of life which cannot be specifically Christian, but should be such that Christian and humanist can join to uphold it' (p. 123).

(3) The Christian Reunion Movement, called to-day the Ecumenical vement, reached its highest point in the affirmations of the Lambeth iscopal Conference of 1920 since when it has retreated and dug itself in, withstanding the trumpet call of the Archbishop of Canterbury in his ous Cambridge sermon of 1945.

Standing on his prophetic turret as he surveys the shrouded future, Spinks in his concluding essay of this arresting volume writes thus of the umenical Movement:

'The history of the schism-ridden past is too often held to be more binding than the living needs of the present . . . It is inevitable that the Roman and non-Roman Churches should fail to find a basis for re-union solely upon Roman terms; but it is improbable that all the non-Roman Christians in the world are going to fit themselves into an episcopal framework' (p.234).

There is only one way in which this episcopal fitting-in can be done and it is when the Primates and Metropolitans of our Anglican Churches plead the adoption of episcopacy on the grounds of its practical utility — as a ifying and effective method of church government. This they ought to lare can be carried out constitutionally and in such a way as to co-operate ternally in combination with Presbyterianism and Congregationalism. The glican attempt to secure the adoption of episcopal government by non-scopal churches is doomed to failure if the claims of episcopacy are urged olutely and on theological grounds. As Dr. Spinks points out citing as authority Bishop Rawlinson:

Dr. Rawlinson (Bishop of Derby) has shown that the present obstacles to reunion could be smoothed away if ordination by bishops could be regarded as a matter of ecclesiastical rule but not of dogmatic necessity' (p. 234).

Only in this way ought episcopacy to be included in the Lambeth Quadri-eral for Christian reunion.

Religion in Britain since 1900 is a remarkable summary of the most signifi-t aspects of our British speaking Christianity during the last fifty years. Spinks and his collaborators are to be congratulated on their achievement. *le, lege.*

H.D.A.M.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HELLENIC ORIGINS*

What is the nature of the mind? What is the soul? What is the nature of life? What happens at death and after? By what forces and by what means are human destinies determined? What is time? Professor Onians' book originated in a desire to discover what were the earliest European speculations on these mysteries. Answers were given to these fundamental questions which for centuries satisfied men's minds and governed their actions. These early beliefs appear to have been embodied in, and serve to explain, a multitude of words and passages in literature, and of theories in later philosophy and science, as well as of myths, legends and customs. To the faithful eye of the student and to the sympathetic imagination of the critic there emerges a remarkable system of beliefs, coherent in itself and, when grasped, not unreasonable, not divorced from experience. Strangely enough the *corpus* of beliefs which we find to be embedded in, or rather to be the framework of, the Homeric literature have been largely shared by other peoples, including Semites and, among 'Indo-Europeans,' by our own Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic ancestors.

It was in 1922 that Professor Onians began his research into the development of ethics among the Greeks, and this was found to involve dealing with their basic psychological, metaphysical and religious concepts. In short, as his researches continued, the extent of his theme grew, and the present work is the result of many years of labour. The greater part of the work is preoccupied with the beliefs of the Homeric Greeks, who are the earliest Europeans of whom we have any adequate knowledge. But although much of the material here is of fascinating interest even to the more or less Greekless reader, his reference to the origins of, and certain parallels with, basic Christian beliefs, such as those of unction, baptism, the Holy Spirit, the divinity of Christ, may make an even wider appeal. Thus a work dealing mainly with pre-Christian origins in Europe, and elsewhere, has bearings upon beliefs which are still part of the living faith of millions, though their difficulties may be a stumbling-block to others.

In one of the addenda to his work Professor Onians gives an indication of his own position in these high matters. He appears to hold fast by

> 'the essential Christian vision of God and of men in relation to Him and to each other, a vision already in great part seen by the noblest Jewish prophets and Greek philosophers but most simply and movingly proclaimed and lived by Jesus.'

This vision, in the writer's opinion, is 'more universal and profound than any of the arrogant ideologies or timid scepticisms of the modern world' and needs to be proclaimed anew, 'freed from the inessential details that have been outgrown.' For these 'prevent its acceptance by critical minds and, scarcely less, by the mass of men.'

How true it is that enlightenment often comes through the historian of ideas. This is an important book. Not only will it be a standard work of reference for Homeric scholars for a generation or more; it is also a mine of information for anyone interested in cultural origins.

J.C.H.

* *The Origins of European Thought.* By R. B. Onians. (Cambridge University Press. 1950. 45/-.)

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF AN EX-RATIONALIST*

'When progressive and thoughtful men become bishops (as is happening in Great Britain to-day) it behoves all who have opposed the Church in the past to reconsider the tactics and strategy which they intend to pursue in future. It has been universally felt in Rationalist circles in the past that the wisest course to be pursued was out-and-out opposition to all the Churches everywhere; but now one begins to sense the beginning of a doubt on this score . . . In Germany, after all, the main opposition to Hitlerism came, and continues to come, not from political and secular movements, but from the churches. Is this altogether accidental?' (p. 76).

This passage is taken from the autobiography of an open-minded Rationa- who had begun to entertain doubts as to whether rationalism provides an -equate inspiration to-day for one who is seeking to lead the larger life of vice to mankind.

The author's doubts were aroused by that type of hard and *nil admirari* ionalism which demanded the expulsion and exclusion of religion (as repre- ted, for instance, by M. J. Guyau's *Non-religion of the Future*) as a factor a progressive civilisation.

Mr. Rowland stresses the reason for his change of outlook as follows:

'For long I had been coming around to the opinion that, whether the religious interpretation of life were true or false, the destruction of religion was dangerous — if only in that it allowed a false god to step into the kind of mental and spiritual vacuum thus caused.' (p. 94).

But perhaps to do justice to this valuable autobiography we ought to begin the beginning. Its author, John Rowland, was born into a Methodist nily which did not however exclude relationship to the parish church where parents were married. But the boy was essentially sceptical. The re- ious fervour of Methodist preachers created no responsive conviction in the nd of their youthful hearer. The appeal of Science by which he was attracted his secondary school in the 1920s, and later pursued in his university career, ried conviction, and satisfied him for many years as adequate for the derstanding of the Universe. He is of opinion that many of his contempor- es shared his outlook and certainly the most intelligent of his fellow- dents looked to Science as capable of providing them, not only with a lihood, but also with a career.

In his first year as an undergraduate he came definitely under the influence the rationalist press.

'I saw a cleverly worded advertisement, asking people interested in science and freedom to apply for a free batch of books on the subject, and for a copy of the journal cunningly called *The Literary Guide*. I cannot think of any advertisement more likely to attract me. It suggested that mixture of science, literature, and (presumably) left wing politics which at that time formed my basic philosophy.' (p. 31).

This was the first step that led him to join the Rationalist Press Association which he finally achieved a position on their editorial staff. But very gradu- y his point of view began to change. Influenced by his studies, not primarily religion, but in politics, economics and criminology, he writes:

'By late 1949 or early 1950, my mind was becoming more and more oriented in a religious direction . . . my last contribution to *The Literary*

* *One Man's Mind*, by John Rowland (S.C.M. 7/6. 1952).

Guide — a review of Jack Clemo's book — appeared in the issue for December 1949, some sixteen years after my first appearance in its columns' (p. 100).

'I was converted to something like a religious point of view largely by reading' (p. 101).

It was an intellectual conversion.

'What, then, is my conclusion? It is that if we are to stop this steady progress towards catastrophe, something must be done to change men's hearts and minds. And to assist that there must be room, inside some Christian Church, for any man honestly dissatisfied with the way the world is going — the man, in other words, who sees that evil is now in the saddle in *all* countries, and that well-meaning politicians, however they try, cannot do much to right things by purely political measures. In fact, it has become obvious that there is something wrong in the heart of man which must be righted before the world can improve. And (it is here that I take the plunge) only by a definite step towards a spiritual combination, which necessarily involves a belief in a power higher than human — in other words, by a belief in the power of God to help man in some degree — can humanity improve its position' (p. 105).

'I draw the conclusion that Christianity can bring a changed life to many people. It has to be accepted first; then it will be found effective. And when a Christian has found that it is effective in his personal life, he will, I am certain, find that it is equally effective for humanity as a whole' (p. 118).

Our readers will find this a most interesting book, not to say, a very useful one if they happen to be teachers of the Christian Religion. Mr. Rowland ends his valuable volume with a telling citation from Schweitzer:

'We are no longer content, like the generations before us, to believe in the Kingdom that comes of itself at the end of time. Mankind to-day must either realise the Kingdom of God or perish.'

H.D.A.M.

SEALING WITH THE SPIRIT

Sacramentalism has a great attraction for the clerical mind. At present in clerical circles it is the sacrament of Baptism which is pre-eminently attractive as charges of 'indiscriminate baptism' are being levied by a group of Anglo-Catholic clergy against their clerical brethren. Their remedy for 'indiscriminate baptism' is 'church discipline.'

We believe that the real remedy is to be found in a better understanding of the nature of Baptism and a further revision of our Prayer Book service of Baptism in the light of such understanding. *The Seal of the Spirit*[1] by the Rev. G. W. H. Lampe, Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, is a very valuable contribution to such understanding. The book is primarily scriptural and theological and only secondarily liturgical. Jewish precedence and their parallels count for little in comparison with the realisation of the Christian experience to which primitive Christian Baptism witnessed. That experience was the gift of the Holy Spirit.

[1] *The Seal of the Spirit* by G. W. H. Lampe, M.C., M.A. (Longmans, 35/-. 1951.)

Baptism is the Pentecostal Sacrament and it was at the first Pentecost at it was administered to 3,000 converted Jews and proselytes in Jerusalem St. Peter and his fellow-apostles.

In the history of the primitive church the *charismata* (spiritual gifts) of e Holy Spirit sometimes preceded baptism, at other times accompanied it, other cases followed it. Mr. Lampe devotes a great deal of research not much to the phenomena as to the essential types of Christian experience hich preceded, accompanied and followed on baptism. The great sacrament the Christian Religion possessed both a proleptic and an eschatological as ell as a psychological significance. But Mr. Lampe's book besides being criptural and historical is essentially practical. He is deeply concerned with mbating erroneous views about Baptism which cause it to be interpreted echanistically, magically and schismatically. And he deplores, the re-troduction into our Anglican baptismal ritual and ceremonial of teaching id practices as repellent to the modern mind as they are to the spiritual aching of the New Testament.

Harnack wrote (the passage is not cited by Mr. Lampe but he would gree with it)

> 'Paul was the first and almost the last theologian of the early Church with whom sacramental theology was really held in check by clear ideas and strictly spiritual considerations. After him all the flood-gates were opened, and in poured the Mysteries with their lore. In Ignatius, who is only sixty years later than Paul, they had already dragged down and engulfed the whole of intelligent theology.' (*Hist. of Dogma* E.T., Vol. i, p. 230.)

In this connection Mr. Lampe regards the 1662 Prayer Book Confirmation ervice as much superior to the Confirmation Service in the Deposited Book f 1928.

Mr. Lampe concludes his scholarly volume in a paragraph which sums p the practical conclusion for modern church policy to which we hope our hurch authorities in our present church crisis will give most serious attention.

> 'Confirmation as practised in the Church of England to-day may have little direct historical connection with what was done by Peter and John in Samaria. To say this is in no way to disparage Confirmation, or to deny that it preserves and maintains important elements in Apostolic doctrine and practice. It is to be acknowledged that under the guidance of the Spirit the ratification of the baptismal profession and the blessing and commissioning which follow it have become the means by which the apparent inconsistencies and theological difficulties attaching to infant Baptism have, at least hitherto, been satisfactorily remedied. At the same time, if we keep in mind the implications of the teaching of the New Testament and the early Church, we shall refuse to accept the doctrine that it is in this rite alone that a man can receive the seal of the Spirit by which he is signed for eternity; we shall not see in it the means by which alone one can be made a full Christian; and we shall recognise the force of Dr. Rawlinson's warning that "it would be a mistake . . . not only in tactics but in theology to insist on the acceptance of Confirmation as an indispensable pre-requisite to reunion . . . or to place the obligatoriness of Confirmation upon the same level with that of Baptism itself"' (p. 322).

H.D.A.M.

THE JUDICIOUS HOOKER

Glamour has cast its mantle over the Elizabethan age, yet among the greatest names of that brilliant era perhaps those who have earned an ever-increasing reputation and a wider fame as the years have passed, are not the courtiers and buccaneers, but the swan of Avon and the judicious Hooker. In an endeavour to assess the place of Hooker himself, the importance of his writings, both in relation to contemporary and present day problems, Canon Shirley has written his book,[1] *Richard Hooker and Contemporary Political Ideas*.

Dr. Shirley opens with a chapter on 'The English Reformation,' with special reference to the Elizabethan settlement. The English Church in its post-Reformation dress has been the subject of attack from every angle. Its position, like that of the British Constitution, often appears incomprehensible to foreigners, yet its inconsistencies are more apparent than real. Hooker defended his beloved Church by the appeal most likely to influence the English mind — that the *Ecclesia Angelicana* was the *via media*.

> 'But neither Roman nor Puritan could understand this *via media*. To the Papist the Anglican Church was a State creature born and bred, having no connection with the historic Church. The Puritan held it a valid enough Church, but in further need of purging. His quarrel was not so much with the Church as with the State for maintaining it; for the basis of all Puritanism was that Church and State were not one and the same; they were two separate kingdoms — a position in direct conflict with the Tudor theory. On this the Puritan erected his platform, and opposition to the Elizabethan Settlement was to come mainly from Geneva, not Rome' (p. 13).

In the second chapter of his book Dr. Shirley outlines the life of Hooker, and also a life of the MSS. of his great book. He maintains that Books 7 and 8 are in the main genuine, but that interpolations are probably frequent. Since Hooker, even in passages of undoubted authenticity, refused slavishly to tie himself to his own opinions with a literal-minded consistency, one cannot argue, because of apparent verbal contradiction between Books 8 and 1, that the later sections are from another hand.

Dr. Shirley then comes to an examination of the Preface to *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. Of this Preface he writes:

> 'It was part of the genius of Hooker that he saw more clearly than most of his contemporaries that the reformation and establishment of religion were fundamentally a question of authority. . . . It imposed upon him a threefold practical task — first, to vindicate the necessity for authority; secondly, to find some more adequate basis for it than the Scriptures; and thirdly, in examining the authority claimed by Calvin to demonstrate its faults, imperfectibilities, and unreasonableness' (pp. 60-1).

Remarkable though Calvin was, Hooker has little difficulty in proving his Discipline to be man-made. Unlike the Continental Reformers, Hooker allies with Scripture, Natural Law as a light to guide Man's feet. He echoes the fifteenth-century Pecock in elevating human reason to its rightful place in a world whose God is Wisdom no less than Love. In this respect Hooker may be claimed to be the father of liberal religious thought in this country.

[1] *Richard Hooker and Contemporary Political Ideas*. By Canon F. J. Shirley. (S.P.C.K., for the Church Historical Society. 1949. 14/6.)

Dr. Shirley further emphasizes this aspect of Hooker's thought in his hapter on 'Law and Authority.' He writes:

> 'By equating *lex* with *ratio* Hooker is erecting an authority — the human reason — as a touchstone of judgment. This was something to place beside the Bible as a Protestant court of appeal. All true law is derived from God and by reason is apprehended. Hooker does not, however, follow the Puritan error of making his authority complete and self-sufficient. He admits that the human reason cannot always penetrate the ways of God, the Fount of all law, and that it must be content to submit where it cannot hope to understand. But he provided new ground on which to meet the Puritans. All previous apologists, including Whitgift himself, had tended to meet the Puritans on their own chosen field — the Scriptures — and to pit one interpretation against another. Hooker, by vindicating the place of reason, translated the controversy to an entirely different level. Thus he managed to close the breach between reason and revelation' (p. 88).

Dr. Shirley next discusses Hooker's theory of the State. Throughout his ook, whenever he touches on political affairs, Hooker has one eye firmly ked upon the Tudor constitution under which he lived, and for which he lt a lively admiration. Nevertheless, two notions appear in the writings of ooker which, taken together, were later to give birth to children Hooker ould have been loth to own. These were the idea of a contract between overnor and governed, and the belief in the unity of the State. Here we ave foreshadowed the rights of man and the modern sovereign state. Thus e now see Hooker, not as the pioneer of liberal religious thought, but as the erald of liberal political development.

For Hooker, the English Church was an essential part of English life. r. Shirley shows how this position was subject to attack from Rome, which jected the insular conception, and also from the Puritan, who rapidly generated into a sectarian. He writes as follows:

> 'Hooker's position is that the nation is a spiritual society, and therefore its head a spiritual head, who is competent to rule in matters other than the commerce of the citizens. . . . Hooker possessed an overwhelming belief, and intuition, that *Ecclesia Angelicana* possessed a vast potentiality, and that his opponents continually missed the point. . . . The truth to Hooker was that Church and State were one society' (pp. 127-8).

There follow three interesting chapters in which Dr. Shirley compares the ews of Hooker with those of the Huguenots and Jesuits of the sixteenth ntury, and also with the standpoint of Jean Bodin. These chapters will be valuable to students who may not be acquainted in detail with these works, r the whole analysis is thorough and profound.

Dr. Shirley then goes on to estimate Hooker's political influence. He ows how at first this was confined to England, how in the early seventeenth ntury Hooker was suspect, since extremism was in the air. Nevertheless, en such as Milton, Andrew Marvell, Edward Gee, Harrington, and, strange it may seem, Thomas Hobbes, all owe a debt to Hooker. Later in the venteenth century Hooker really came into his own, for the Whig writers lgernon Sidney and John Locke make no secret of their high opinion of *The ws of Ecclesiastical Polity,* and frequently quote from its pages. The in- ence of Locke was profound and lasting, and in part at least his teaching as based upon that of Hooker. Thus the book which was written to bolster the Elizabethan religious settlement also aided subsequently in giving oral support to the Whig political *régime*.

Dr. Shirley ends his book with a chapter called 'The Final Assessment.' He asks and essays to answer the intriguing question, 'What would Hooker say to our church problems to-day?' Once again the question of Church and State is engaging men's attention. Dr. Shirley feels that Hooker would approve of the Establishment, despite its imperfections, and would encourage the closest possible alliance with the Free Churches. He writes:

> 'Episcopacy presents the first difficulty, yet the Anglican Church can hardly in this century, which is full of menace to Christianity's very existence, deny the validity of the Reformed Churches which it acknowledged in the sixteenth. It extended the hand of fellowship, and for a century welcomed Ministers into its own ranks; not less friendship is required now' (p. 248).

Later Dr. Shirley quotes with approval Archbishop Tenison's speech in the House of Lords against the Bill for Preventing Occasional Conformity. The Archbishop said:

> 'At a time that the Protestant Dissenters are heartily united with us against the common foes to our religion and government: what advantage these, who are in earnest for defending these things, can have by lessening the number of such as are firmly united in this cause, I cannot for my life imagine' (p. 255).

This surely is a book for all Anglo-Catholics to read and all Anglican ordinands. Dr. Shirley has undertaken a great task and has performed it singularly well. His book is at once scholarly and attractive, readable and instructive. It deals with religion and politics, with the things of man and the things of God, and its conclusions are well-balanced and its judgment sound. The whole matter may be summed up by applying to this book the epithet so long appropriated by Hooker himself, when we say that the disciple is as his master, and may truly be termed judicious.

GEOFFREY PARRISH

WORDS OF A BELIEVER*

Gibbon was of the opinion that European civilisation was permanently safe because it could deal successfully with any exterior barbarian who might be asking for trouble. What we are confronted with to-day is not only the external barbarian, who is more dangerous than in Gibbon's day, because he has learned to use our lethal devices, but the barbarian within our civilisation. We have the problem

> 'of people who can manage motor-cars and radios and who can understand the utilitarian adjustment of means and ends in the material world, but consider the finer subtleties of civilisation a luxury and a superfluity, and have no notion what is due to personality.'

This is distressing enough. But Professor Butterfield makes the suggestion that the Christian should not carry his distress too far. He

> 'has no right to be angry or surprised or Pharisaical when confronted with the spectacle of human wilfulness and even cruelty. The Christian understands it better than anybody else does — understands it as one who feels himself a partner in man's universal sin. For the Christians

* *History and Human Relations.* By Herbert Butterfield. (Collins. 10/6. 1951.)

are not the righteous — they are the ones who confess themselves to be sinners. And they have a safety-valve against certain kinds of hardness of heart by that fact.'

The Christian 'law of love' in short comprises charitable-mindedness, ich is an antidote to the legalism and the Pharisaism that the New Testa- nt condemns. The fundamental rule of Christian conduct is clear, though mind may not take naturally to it, namely that 'we should judge all men be sinners, but treat all men as born for eternity.'

'We are to love all men in spite of the fact that they are sinners, partly because we know that we are sinners ourselves. We are to love them even when they go on sinning — for otherwise how could Christ have loved us? We are to love them even if we have to fight them — we have to love our enemies and never treat them as subhuman or as children of the devil, even if they treat others so; for otherwise how would mankind ever be lifted above barbarism? For the Christian it is not sufficient just to beat the sinner and conquer him, or score over him — the object is to win him from his sins.'

No doubt it is easy for the cynic — and many of our intellectuals display it failing — to cast doubt upon the efficacy of such treatment, but a Profes- of Modern History in the University of Cambridge, should know how ny calamities have taken place from the fanatical intolerance and Phari- cal self-righteousness which he deprecates. For example, if there had en more people in England like Lord Falkland at the time of the Civil War, would either not have taken place, or would have ended in a rational com- mise. Most wars go on far too long. In the more tolerant days of the hteenth century, statesmen knew when to end them, while the modern litician apparently does not.

Perhaps the most interesting essay in this collection is the one entitled he Tragic Element in Modern International Conflict,' in which it is pointed t that there may exist a certain situation or predicament that contains the ments of a conflict irrespective of any special wickedness in any of the rties concerned. Contemporary ways of formulating the human conflict ve the structure of melodrama, the white hero fighting the black villain of piece in a straight conflict of right and wrong. But in course of time in writing of history the lines of the picture are differently drawn. 'The gher historiography moves away from melodrama and brings out the tragic ment in human conflict.' We who are so deeply engaged in an age of nflict should not forget how future historiography may expose the limita- ns of our present vision.

In this connection the essay, 'Official History: its Pitfalls and Criteria,' of interest and importance inasmuch as it concerns the relationship of hnical historians to 'official history.'

'There is need for a very precise code of guarantees to assure one that the interests of independent historical science have been guarded in a watertight manner, considering the pitfalls that exist.'

This volume would have been of value in any case, being the work of one our leading historical scholars. But what makes it of exceptional value at present time is that it is written by one who makes no secret of the fact at he writes as a Christian — and a Christian who has a grasp of world ents. Why is it that a book like this comes from the pen of a layman, and t of a bishop? It is not only that the writer of it has the learning; he has mething else as well—the power of detachment, of insight, of seeing things they are, not as they are made to appear. J.C.H.

THE BUDDHIST WAY OF LIFE*

In *The Buddhist Way of Life*, a volume of less than 200 pages, Dr. Harold Smith has given us a scholarly and sober estimate of one of the great world-religions. Beginning with a study of the historical background of Gotama himself, he leads us on to the tradition of the Buddhist Church, and a critical estimate of that tradition and of the historical Buddha; afterwards he deals with the distinctive features of Buddhism in its mission-fields, particularly China and Japan.

Dr. Smith writes as one who has made an extensive study of the Buddhist Scriptures. Indeed, for the ordinary reader, the endless multiplicity of Pali names and titles in the book may be bewildering rather than illuminating; while the advanced scholar who wants to look up references will wish for clearer guidance than is here given. (The 'references' consist merely of the names of the sources, in brackets, without any indication of chapter or section.) In this respect, the book tends to 'fall between two stools'—the 'popular' and the 'learned.'

Dr. Smith is inclined to favour the view so fervently espoused by Mrs. Rhys Davids, that Gotama himself was really a warmer and more lovable personality than the emotionless ascetic pictured in the *Hinayana* (Puritan) tradition of Ceylon and Burma (pp. 71 ff.); and he thinks that the *Mahayana* ('Modernist') tradition of Japanese Buddhism, which worships the Buddha as a loving Saviour-God, may witness to a genuine element in Gotama's thought and character (p. 88).

To the Christian reader, it is interesting to notice how, in spite of the profound—perhaps irreconcilable—differences between the *Weltanschauung* of the Buddha and that of the Christ, the developments of the two religions have followed very similar lines. Both alike can trace their origin to a person whose historicity has been established beyond reasonable doubt. Around both these persons, legends of marvellous happenings (not necessarily in all cases untrue) have gathered, in the tradition of their followers. In both cases, one particular interpretation of their person has received the *imprimatur* of orthodoxy, and others have been suppressed as 'heretical' (pp. 23 f). The doctrine of Redemption through vicarious suffering, which is central in the Christian Gospel, is also found in *Mahayana* Buddhism (p. 123), which indeed shows many points of resemblance to Catholic Modernism in Christianity (pp. 119, etc.). In the *Hinayana*, with its narrower, sterner note, we seem to be nearer to the spirit of orthodox Protestantism.

The chapters (xii-xvii) on Chinese and Japanese Buddhism are among the most interesting in the book and illustrate the amazing capacity of the Buddhist Church for adapting itself to fresh backgrounds of thought and for taking under its capacious wing other religious systems. In this case, too, the Christian Church has at times manifested a similar capacity for 'adaptation'—though this has rarely been admitted officially, or consciously adopted as an avowed policy by the leaders of the Church. E. C. DEWICK

THIS WAY FOR UTOPIA†

A talisman to effect a cure for the ills from which our society suffers would indeed be welcome. Professor Barbara Wootton attempts to show where such a talisman is to be found, namely in a more resolute application of scientific principles, especially the principles of psychology, sociology, and anthropology.

* *The Buddhist Way of Life* by F. Harold Smith, D.D. (Hutchinson's World Library. 7/6 1951.)

† *Testament for Social Science.* By Barbara Wootton. (Allen & Unwin. 1950. 15/-.)

r idea is that if the laws of human behaviour were better understood, asures of a scientific kind might be taken to improve it.

Before getting to work on this fertile theme Professor Wootton devotes at seems an excessive amount of space to the examination and criticism certain obstructive attitudes which she terms 'pre-scientific.' Out of eight apters three are wholly devoted to this theme, which often amounts to a ying of the slain. One of the obstacles listed by her is the failure to ognize the distinction between verbal and non-verbal issues. This indeed is ponsible for much futile argumentation, especially when strong emotional sociations are attached to particular words such as democracy and socialism. ese tend to become emotive symbols incapable of precise definition but ely to engender profitless heat. A further obstacle to the rational treatnt of social problems is a dreary prevalence of *isms* of various brands, all ng more or less dogmatic systems accepted as matters of faith and resentl of criticism and questioning. It is significant, remarks Professor Wootton, t words ending with this lamentable syllable do not occur in literature voted to the exact sciences.

Two other blind alleys are also indicated into which sociological inquiries apt to wander, namely muddled biological analogies such as those sociated with the names of Spengler and Toynbee, and the pseudo-scientific ories of Marx. Toynbee's analogy between the life-cycle of an organism d the rise, maturity, decline and death of a civilization is inexact and apt be misleading. As for Marx, his occasionally illuminating hypotheses ame petrified into a dogmatic system, so that the prophet could not be ply right up to a point, but must be correct all the way through.

Professor Wootton also takes exception to the claim of theologians to in possession of knowledge derived from extra-scientific sources, that is to from revelation. She quotes Canon Alan Richardson as claiming that such elation is miraculous and comes by miraculous means, while for the acceace of truths thus revealed 'the gift of faith' is necessary. Such a view, points out, implies acceptance of the proposition that our knowledge is ived from two distinct sources—direct spiritual apprehension and scientific thod. In which case, the revealed knowledge cannot but lack that iversality of acceptance which the five senses guarantee for scientific owledge.

The theory of revelation advanced by Canon Richardson is indeed too id, and he would have been on firmer ground had he drawn a parallel ween spiritual or religious perception on the one hand and aesthetic perotion on the other. Aesthetic sensibility can be regarded as reliable without ng regarded as supernatural. The fact is that the supernatural should not introduced as an explanation until the limits of the natural are fully known d defined; and that is by no means the case as yet.

One feels too that Professor Wootton is right in rejecting Canon Richardn's claim that theology is a science. In the first place theologians are unling to regard their theories simply in the light of hypotheses as the men science are wont to do, and in the second place theological doctrines lack empirical basis upon which scientific theories stand.

Professor Wootton also takes justifiable exception to Sir Walter Moberly's vocacy, in his *The Crisis in the University,* of the teaching of Christian ology as a kind of official doctrine at our universities. Undergraduates ent official doctrines in any case. While if it should become the accepted actice (as it sometimes is) that scientific canons of criticism should be applied ly 'within the prescribed limit,' university theology would become that of eminary.

But with regard to Professor Wootton's main thesis, the trouble is that neither psychology nor sociology can as yet be regarded as exact sciences, and this is especially true of the latter. Nor is it likely that they will become so in the foreseeable future. When the physical sciences once got into their stride their success was phenomenal, but sociology still makes much cry for little wool. As Mrs. Susanne Langer has put it:

> 'The physical sciences found their stride without much hesitation; psychology and sociology tried hard and seriously to "catch the tune and keep the step," but with mathematical laws they were never really handy. Psychologists still tell us that their lack of laws and calculable results is due to the fact that psychology is but young. When physics was as old as psychology is now, it was a definite, systematic body of highly general facts, and the possibilities of its future expansion were clearly visible in every line of its natural progress.'[1]

The truth is that human nature as a subject for exact inquiry is less amenable to mathematical treatment than are entities studied by chemists and physicists. Professor Wootton's book will disappoint those who seek in it a practical programme of action to reduce the risk of wars, to mollify political friction, to diminish fanaticism, to promote among the public a better understanding of personal problems, and so on. But her book is highly readable, and though it displays a definitely secularist trend, that is no doubt a fashionable and widely acceptable characteristic, and will not prejudice its circulation. On the whole Professor Wootton is on the side of the angels, though she may not relish so painful a testimonial. J.C.H.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF WALLACE ELLIOTT

Canon W. H. Elliott's autobiography, *Undiscovered Ends*,[2] is a book to be read by all candidates for Holy Orders.

When J. H. Newman, as Cardinal, had to select a motto for his insignia as a Prince of the Church, he chose *Cor ad cor loquitur* — heart speaks to heart. This might well be the motto of Canon Elliott in his revealing volume. Homeliness, simplicity, religious and moral emotion, together with courageous frankness and a sense of humour, characterise the narrative. As we read it we feel with and for its author. The humble environment of his early life; his profound sense of a divine call to the ministry of the National Church; his educational career, particularly at Brasenose, Oxford, and later in his Theological College at Ripon: his clerical career in Yorkshire, Folkestone and later in London as Canon of St. Paul's: rector of St. Michael's, Chester Square: Dean of the Chapels Royal and finally incumbent of St. Mary's, Warwick, are recounted with arresting intimacy and candour. He became an immensely attractive preacher, and in the closest connection with his preaching, a much valued pastor of souls. Every church to which he was appointed he filled with crowded congregations with the exception of St. Paul's Cathedral which last he was convinced he could have filled had its out-of-date regulations given him a fair chance.

The development of his powers as a preacher he attributes to the sermon classes conducted by Bishop Boyd-Carpenter during his studentship in Ripon Theological College where, appropriately enough, one of his fellow-students was Studdert Kennedy. Even as a curate in Leeds parish church he attracted an immense congregation consisting mostly of men, some of whom had to find

[1] *Philosophy in a New Key*, p. 16.

[2] *Undiscovered Ends* by W. H. Elliott (Chaplain to the King, Canon Emeritus of Coventry). (Peter Davies. 1951. Price 12/6).

its on the chancel steps. He took painstaking care in the preparation of is sermons, selecting his theme as many days beforehand as possible, and en discussing various points and problems arising out of it with parishioners his assiduous visitations, and last but not least he always included in his mon at least two telling stories — humorous if possible.

Although naturally shy, except with boys, he made the most resolute forts to be cordial to all — not such a very easy achievement in Yorkshire — ere however he succeeded in becoming a life-long friend of many.

With his increasing reputation as a national preacher he came into touch th many most interesting people and of course not least with members of e royal family. Of this intercourse his book contains many interesting ories. We conclude this review with Elliott's account of an interview anted to him by Lloyd George before the Second World War.

'In our talk we were very candid. Politically he was astonishingly right in what he saw coming. "When Hitler meets Chamberlain," he said, "it will be like a big bully taking a piece of candy out of a child's hand." He had had some experience of course — with the old Tiger, Clemenceau. He also said that the great enemy was not Germany at all but Russia — a nation of immense potentialities and definitely hostile to us. All of that was fulfilled most tragically in the next few years. How many, with the exception of Lloyd George, could see the Russian menace coming? And what changes would it have made in our foreign policy if those in authority had seen it coming?

On other issues even more fundamental we talked, and he said that in conscience he entirely agreed. "Then why not speak out?" I asked him. To which came the answer, which I have had from so many and always with the same negative results — "I will think it over." He did add, though, "To say what I have just said would lose me all the Labour votes".'

SERMONS ON CHRISTIAN UNITY*

The Approach to Christian Unity is a valuable collection of nine sermons eached before the University of Cambridge in 1951 with a brief but arresting troduction by S. C. Rogers, Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge, who that time was Vice-Chancellor of the University. The preachers were Prof. orman Sykes, Dr. Micklem, Principal Payne, Rev. M. B. Dewey, Dr. hitehorn, Principal Newton Flew, Bishop Cassianos (Orthodox) and the shop of Chichester. The volume concludes with a sermon by the Bishop of echin on the same theme but not preached in the series. The Vice-Chancellor ds his Introduction with the pregnant reflection:

'There is considerable disagreement in this book; but there is an abundance of liberal thought.'

For those who desire a reliable, cautious and concise historical statement the position of the Church of England in relation to the campaign for hristian Unity we know nothing better than the contribution of Dr. Norman kes. But it may be asked: What about the campaign for Christian Unity? ow is the battle going?

If we exclude South India's remarkable achievement and the conferences the Ecumenical Movement the present position, so far as the Anglican hurch is concerned is thus summed up by Dr. Bell, Bishop of Chichester.

'So far as the achievement of a visible unity is concerned, or the new outlook and new measures to which the Lambeth Appeal summoned all Christian people, we are no further forward in 1951 than we were in 1920.

* *The Approach to Christian Unity.* (Heffer, Cambridge, 4/-. 1951.)

Indeed, in some ways, the reports of earlier conferences went further and were more hopeful than their successors.' (p. 58).

Later on the Bishop asks a pertinent question:

'Dare we sit down and do nothing?'

Our answer to that question is:

'Implement inter-communion as the first practical step and go on supporting it with Christian inter-education.' H.D.A.M.

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH AND OURSELVES

In 1861 Dean Stanley published his *Lectures on the Greek Church.* This volume, attractive in style and sympathetic in its treatment of its theme, constituted for English Churchmen their introduction to the study of Eastern Christendom. In those days the contact of English Churchmen with Greek Orthodoxy was slight indeed. The establishment of the English Bishopric in Jerusalem advanced it and the official visit of Mandell Creighton who returned from St. Petersburg wearing a large Greek Cross, henceforth adopted by the English Episcopate as an addition to their episcopal insignia, brought the contact symbolically closer. Another advance was achieved when an Orthodox Prelate, the guest of Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln united with him in reciting the 'Nicene Creed,' but in Greek, which of course omitted the *filioque* clause.

Then came our English ecumenical movement in whose gatherings Greek Prelates presented, in the words of Sir William Ashley, 'the irritating combination of picturesqueness with ineffectiveness.'

But what is the situation to-day? It is summed up for us by R. M. French in his most readable and sympathetic little volume *The Eastern Orthodox Church,*[1] a worthy successor to Dean Stanley's *Lectures*. Mr. French writes:

'Orthodoxy has been cautious, and to some extent suspicious in its contact with other Confessions. Its readiness to come into closer touch with them has ebbed and flowed. For instance, in 1925 almost the whole Orthodox world was represented at the Nicene Commemoration in London. But in 1948 the Orthodox assembled at Moscow to celebrate the five-hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the independence of the Russian Church, all, with the exception of the representatives of Constantinople and Greece, subscribed to pronouncements which, as well as expressing the traditional Orthodox hostility to the Vatican, were unfavourable both to the recognition of Anglican Orders and to the Ecumenical Movement. They declined to take any part in the meeting of the World Conference of Churches at Amsterdam in that year' (p. 164).

This is not very cheering but the influence of the political situation which, ever since the days of Constantine the Great, has powerfully affected the Orthodox Church is at least partly responsible for the existing situation. Were the Russian State more friendly to the English State, the Russian Church would be more friendly to the English Church. Mr. French's volume contains many thought-provoking comparisons. We can but refer to one. In some Christian churches the dominant motive is fear, in others it is duty, in the Orthodox Church it is consciousness

'of the reality of the unseen world and the permeation of this world by the other. . . . This explains the central position which Easter occupies in the spiritual life of Orthodoxy.' (p. 150). H.D.A.M.

[1] *The Eastern Orthodox Church,* by the Rev. R. M. French (Hutchinsons University Library: Editor, E. O. James, 1951, 7/6).

BRAINS TRUST

Dr. E. C. Dewick's question.

In your issue of December, 1951 (p. 342), the Rev. R. Gardner raised question whether it is essential for Christianity that it should claim to be Absolute and Final Religion.

It seems to me that this question calls for very careful consideration day. In the past, it has generally been taken for granted, even by Liberal urchmen, that the answer must be in the affirmative, and that 'the whole nificance of Christianity depends on its claim to be absolute and final' (W. mple, at the Jerusalem Missionary Conference, 1928). Undoubtedly this is harmony with the main tradition of Christendom throughout the ages, and late it has been reaffirmed with increased emphasis by the exponents of the w 'Biblical Theology.' Such a tradition is not lightly to be challenged.

On the other hand, I think it is evident that there are many to-day who, ile desirous to profess and call themselves Christians, fully convinced that Jesus Christ we have the highest revelation of God, and in the Christian ligion the highest known religion, nevertheless hesitate to go beyond this, d affirm that Christianity is for all time and in all places the Final and solute Religion.

The reasons for this hesitation include the following:

1. The Comparative Study of Religion during the last century has shown t a similar claim to absolute finality has been made by every one of the rld's major religions. According to orthodox Hinduism, the Vedas were bally dictated by God, and are therefore infallible and perfect (Das Gupta, *ndu Philosophy*, I, p. 11). To the Muslim, the Holy Qur'án is 'a perfect elation of the Divine Will' (Md. Ali, *The Qur'án*, p. xxviii). Few, if any, ristians would endorse these claims. But when students ask: Why should reject these, and yet accept similar claims on behalf of Christianity, the swer often seems to be simply: 'If you are a Christian, you *must* start m the assumption that Christianity is the Final Religion!' And that swer does not satisfy the inquiring mind.

2. To the student of history, another aspect of the problem presents itself. is often asserted to-day that since the Incarnation of God in Jesus Christ s final and absolute, 'the one and only occasion on which God Himself has sonally come down to earth,' it must follow that human history since the carnation is essentially different from what it was previously. But in a ent issue of the *Hibbert Journal* (Vol. XLIV, p. 90) Dr. Nicol Cross has sed a question which has probably occurred to many minds:

> '*Can* we say that history A.D. offers any spectacular or cataclysmic contrast to history B.C.? Does the state of the world since A.D. 1 indicate the operation of a force wholly dissimilar and *sui generis*, introduced into human nature in the first century of our era?'

that question it seems to me that a more convincing answer is needed than y that has so far been given by orthodox Christian writers.

3. Above all, to students trained in the methods and principles of physical ence, the claim to absolute finality is a serious stumbling-block. For they ve been taught that it is of the essence of true science to be prepared to dify all theories, if fresh evidence requires this; and to observe caution in ir affirmations, abstaining from 'assertions that outstrip the evidence' (Sir A. Thomson). Now a claim to absolute finality does, by its very nature, utstrip the evidence.' Christian theologians generally admit this; but then

they proceed to say, in effect, 'We shall not attempt to give reasons for this claim; we simply affirm that it *is* of the essence of the Christian Faith' (*e.g.* Dr. N. Micklem, in *What is Faith?* p. 45). Few students of science are likely to be satisfied with this.

'But,' it is often said, 'the claim to finality is *vital* for the maintenance of personal Christian faith, and for the whole missionary enterprise of the Church.' Undoubtedly such a claim does generate enthusiasm and energy. We can see this in all Totalitarian systems — Roman Catholicism, Fundamentalism — and Communism. But immediate dynamic effectiveness is not, of itself, a proof of value or truth; and, in the long run, only Truth will prevail. Moreover, is it certain that only an 'absolutist' religion can inspire enthusiasm for spreading its message? A learned Roman Catholic historian of Missions, Fr. Schmidlin, has maintained that even a conviction of *relative* superiority can give an adequate missionary motive (*Catholic Missionary Theory,* p. 97). Certainly, in the sphere of medicine, a doctor does not need to claim that his science is *perfect,* before he goes out to bring help to his patients; and why should it be otherwise with physicians of the soul?

I am not here attempting to answer the question that Mr. Gardner has raised, but only to urge that it needs an answer, by wiser minds than mine; and that the issue should not be regarded as closed, for all Christians. A wise Cambridge scholar, Prof. J. M. Creed, wrote in 1926:

> 'Christian theology need not claim that the Christian religion contains all truth, or even all truth that is of religious value.'
>
> 'But' (he adds) 'if it loses the conviction that in Christ it has found the deepest truth about God, then it *has* lost itself' (*The Divinity of Christ,* p. 112).

Perhaps these words may suggest the lines along which an answer to Mr. Gardner's question may be found. E. C. DEWICK

Cambridge, *April* 1952.

Dr. A. C. Bouquet's reply

I have been asked to suggest some answers to the query raised by Dr. Dewick and I very readily do so. It is of course difficult for any Christian theologian to avoid giving the impression that he is being guilty of special pleading or wishful thinking, in dealing with this claim of Christianity to be the Absolute and Final Religion.

Perhaps the more satisfactory plan will be to confine oneself as much as possible to facts, rather than to engage in argument.

1. It is, I believe, a fact that the idea of an Absolute and Final Religion is a Hebraeo-Christian product, and that it was not present as a prominent dogmatic assertion in Hinduism until after the latter had come into contact with Christian propagandists. Before that, the religion of non-Moslem India differed very little in essence from that of the Hellenistic world, and curiously enough it resembled it in one specific feature, *i.e.* in its disregard of history. Men like Celsus found it difficult to accept the claim that in the historical events of the Gospels you had absolute and normative actions of Deity in the spatio-temporal order. They believed in recurrent world-cycles, and as Dr. Inge has said: 'Their universities had no chairs of history.'

If therefore we are confronted with claims to absoluteness in non-Christian religions we should recognise that they are unlikely to be independent growths. Hebrew prophetic religion came first in making such a claim, and Christians asserted that they were the true spiritual Israel, and that their religion was the

ıe and logical development of the religion of the Jews. Islam plainly borrows s idea from the Hebraeo-Christian complex. Orthodox Hinduism, as the igion of Hind or India, ought not logically to make a claim to absoluteness. modernised Hinduism, like Buddhism (which bears somewhat the same ation to Hinduism that Christianity does to Judaism), can and does make ch a claim, and both Buddhism and the higher Hinduism present themselves real alternatives to orthodox Christianity, with its insistence upon the odness of the world, the reality of time, and the consequent significance of story, and with its teaching about the need of redemption, its affirmations out the reality and worth of the individual soul, and its insistence that ere exists a Holy God who is both immanent and transcendent, and who is e Crown and Climax of personality. A choice must be made here between o forms of belief. Both cannot be absolute. Very different types of indi- idual—Edwyn Bevan on the one hand, Aldous Huxley on the other, approach- g the problem from totally different standpoints—have seen this with the most clarity.

2. Coming now to the credibility of an absolute religion arising in the time Tiberius Caesar. Why should it seem more incredible than the possibility a normative school of sculpture arising in the time of Pheidias and axiteles?—Or of a decisive development in the natural sciences taking place the first half of the twentieth century (or the first half of the nineteenth, if u prefer that)? Peaks of human achievement occur at intervals throughout e ages, and do not repeat themselves. (Are they perhaps gifts of God ccessively bestowed)? As I. A. Richards has said in regard to masterpieces literature: 'The best is often that which comes first, comes suddenly, and es not come again.' May not this be true of religion? One thing is certain, a former President of the M.C.U. has put it: To say that when the last man tottering to his frozen grave, and the planet that is to shatter the earth has peared to view in the sky, only then can the will and purpose of God be ly known, to say this, is really to deny the love and goodness of God and o to make nonsense of such knowledge, since it involves the absurdity that e full and complete religion can only be known when there are no longer any man beings to benefit by it, or to live the life which it demands. (I have raphrased Dean Matthews, but only in order to bring out his meaning.) ıe main point is that if such a thing as an absolute and normative religion to be vouchsafed to us, its advent is not to be looked for in extreme antiquity, at a time when the earth is senile, but at some middle point in human story, when the time is ready and favourable for its emergence.

3. Dr. Nicol Cross is surely burdened by an undue and unjustifiable ssimism. There has never at any time been a case for rejecting the belief at a *proportion* of the human race would refuse to accept Christ as their ader. But why denigrate the value of *agapē*?—I appeal to the fact that the thronement of this virtue in the lives of sincere Christians *has* introduced a rce *sui generis* into human society since the first century A.D. The Buddhist ettā and the Chinese *jen* and *ai* are but shadows of it in its transforming wer. Christians have made many grievous blunders and committed many ocking disloyalties and inconsistencies, but their religion is still very young d immature, and the evidence shows that its constructive philanthropy ows rather than diminishes.

4. An active religious belief must needs contain three elements. It must some sense affirm the world. It must stretch out beyond the world (this is t necessarily the same as escapism). It must seek to transform the world. e can see that from now onward any religion which omits or suppresses the

third element is doomed to destruction. It has no future. I refrain from making comparisons, but I invite both Christians of all denominations and all non-Christians to examine their own tenets courageously in the light of this analysis. For myself I can only see that the choice would appear to be between a world transformed by the love manifest in Christ, and a world bludgeoned into a new shape by the operation of hatred and force. We may, of course, get the latter, but in that event it will be a worse world, and it will also be a foolish one, since it will be aiming at the construction of a materialistic earthly paradise on a fragment of stellar matter of which the inhabitants only hold a precarious leasehold tenure. I cannot accept such a limited objective. If the spiritual values we cherish have no future beyond this present temporal order, then the whole universe is a cheat, and we are of all organic creatures the most miserable.

5. I think that there is danger of a confusion of thought in saying that to students trained in the methods and principles of physical science the claim to absolute finality is a serious stumbling-block. It is, if we are concerned only with the category of discovery, with man's quest for God. But Christianity has always presented itself not as discovery, but as a unique Self-Revealing Act of God. Such an act would be likely to be final and absolute, and it would not be incongruous to see in it also the means of a unique Deliverance for man from his incorrigible self-centredness. To be the recipients of such an act would not hinder us in the least from going on to learn more and more about its implications, to grow into an appreciation of it as truth, and to find out how to apply it to the redemption of the whole of society. It is therefore quite reasonable to speak of the evolution of Christianity as continuing into the future, and to expect it to display itself in many forms and with ever richer developments, even though the core of it will remain the same.

Dr. Major's reply

We should not use the terms 'absolute and final' to describe the Christian Religion although we believe in its essential Truth. The Christian Religion, besides being for us the Religion of the Historic Jesus Christ, is also the Religion of the Holy Spirit. It is therefore evolutional, and not until that spiritual and moral evolution is completed is it possible to speak of the Christian Religion, as we know it, as final. The guidance into all the Truth—and in the Fourth Gospel the Truth means the Religion of Jesus—demands incessant development, not only in the understanding of all that that religion involves but also constant development in its adherents. H.D.A.M.

B. Question from the Rev. Gerald Herring, Parys Hotel, Parys, S. Africa

'If we could abolish sin, cruelty and crime, what would happen to the creative artists—to such as Shakespeare, Dickens and Browning? These evils were their "meat". We should have a world without Art. With all evil and dirt abolished, what place, or significance, would there be for our William Booths and our Florence Nightingales?

'Even, it would seem, the Supreme Creator needs, to make His Book, a Serpent, a Cain, and a host of horrors. I am also told, on good authority, that Bishops and other kindly creatures, just love pondering on murder mysteries. As for bookies and the mass of ordinary folk, their "Sunday Crimes" is almost indispensable. A world without evil—could we "stick it"?'

(1) *Answer from Miss Alice M. Ashley*

'This question raises, to my mind, the whole problem of spiritual development and its relation to free will. The choice between good and evil, at all

els, is ever present, and is essential to growth. I agree, to some extent, th the questioner; the creative artist does, in part, derive his stimulus from ntemplation of the ever-continuing struggle against evil, and he attempts present to others the many different facets of the conflict, both in the iverse and in men's minds. But is not the stimulus due rather to his interest the struggle and his vivid realization of the folly and weakness of mankind, n to the contemplation of evil itself? (And is not the social reformer pelled to action by a similar awareness?) Further, we must recognize the th that, on occasion, artists choose as their theme the beautiful, unimpaired evil. I am thinking here of Keats, Botticelli, Mozart, and many others— d Shakespeare himself in more than one connection.

'Similarly, the Old Testament stories gain much of their effectiveness not m emphasis on sin alone, but from the examples they provide of man's rying reaction to temptation and to the promptings of his higher nature. d here also the balance should be restored by remembering the theme of vine perfection which we find in the Prophets.

'With regard to the "Bishops and other kindly creatures" may we not ume that they are similarly interested in the complicated interplay of good d evil depicted in the murder and mystery stories, rather than in the sentation of evil itself? And possibly "the mass of ordinary folk" seek, the same way, for mental exercise on an equally unexacting plane.

'Finally, the questioner asks "Could we stick it?" But at this stage of r knowledge this question has little reality, for who would be the "we," d what would be the "it"?'

Answer from Mrs. V. Bremner, Brasted Chart, Sevenoaks

'"Sunday Crimes" and detective stories are presumably the escape chanisms of types of people as alternatives to crooners, gardening, cinemas tinkering with the car, all according to taste. Vicarious thrills are the sions, not the "meat" of the kindly creatures, who may have much to them.

'In another category are those escapists "who will not," as R. H. Ward s, "die into a harsh experience and live it through to the point where death lares itself to be the gate of life; the point at which "sudden the worst ns the best to the brave."

'But I imagine the portrayal of "sin, cruelty and crime" by the creative ist is because the artist is, or should be, dealing with real life. This conflict ween good and evil is the substance from which we build life—the drama l the goal ahead:

> "Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp,
> Or what's a heaven for? All is silver-grey
> Placid and perfect with my art: the worse!"

'To go down into evil and suffering is the work of Christ and those who k in His Name, the pattern of the Cross enough to live by.

'"... Christ came, and He did not really explain it; He did far more. met it, willed it, transformed it, and He taught us how to do all this, or ner, He Himself does it within us, if we do not hinder the all-healing ds."

'As evils are abolished, we climb to new levels and meet new forms of evil ecome more sensitive to more elusive sins.

'When "earth's last picture is painted" and Satan has finally seen the ormity of sin, perhaps we are ready for the poem of James Stephens, when fallen angel is drawn back into Heaven?'

CORRESPONDENCE

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

SIR,

In your issue of March, 1952, in an article by Mr. J. C. Hardwick, entitled 'The Paradise of Sectarianism,' there appears a reference to Christian Science as a 'strange new cult.' I am well aware that the writer means no unkindness in his remarks and would ask him to read none into this my reply, for which I would be grateful if you could find space in your magazine.

May I point out that Christian Science is neither new nor strange. Jesus proved the efficacy of his religion by healing the sick and enjoined his followers to do this. The discoverer and founder of Christian Science, Mary Baker Eddy, taught her followers to understand how Jesus healed, and how to follow His example.

We rejoice that other churches are finding it no strange thing that the sick should be healed by spiritual means, and that though this may appear to be a new thing, yet it is something which has always been available to mankind, though unused and not understood during many centuries.

B. G. POPE,

31 Oxford Road,
Banbury, Oxon.

I am very sorry if offence was given, for it was not intended. In the article Christian Science was classed along with several other contemporary cults as 'new and strange,' which is what, I think, at the time they all were. But there is no necessary harm in being new and strange. On the contrary, such qualities may be stimulating and salutary. St. Paul, we remember, was characterised as 'a setter up of strange gods.'

J. C. HARDWICK

In Memoriam:

CANON H. P. PLUMPTRE

From *The Times*, April 12th, 1952.

PLUMPTRE.—On April 9th, 1952, in Toronto, Canada, the Rev. Canon Henry P. Plumptre, D.D., formerly Rector of St. James's Cathedral, Toronto.

THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

Evidence submitted by the Royal Commission on Marriage and Divorce on behalf of the Union

Together with articles in support

Foreword by Sir Henry Self, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., K.B.E., M.SC., B.D.

Introduction by the Dean of St. Paul's, K.C.V.O., D.D.

To be obtained from the Rev. T. J. Wood, Charlbury Vicarage, Oxford
Price 2s. 2d. post free